ESSAYS IN SOCIAL SCIENCES No 2

Editor

K. ISHWARAN

University Professor and Head of the Department of
Anthropology and Social Welfare, Karnatak University

URBAN SOCIOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY
AND SOCIAL WELFARE, KARNATAK UNIVERSITY

URBAN SOCIOLOGY

NELS ANDERSON
and
K ISHWARAN

BIRCHAND PUBLIC LIBRARY
AGARTALA

ASIA PUBLISHING HOUSE
BOMBAY . CALCUTTA . NEW DELHI . MADRAS . LUCKNOW

PRINTED IN INDIA

BY G C RAY AT NAVANA PRINTING WORKS PRIVATE LIMITED,
47, GANESH CHUNDER AVENUE, CALCUTTA 13, AND PUBLISHED
BY P S JAYASINGHE, ASIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, BOMBAY

INTRODUCTION

MAINLY because the industrial urban civilization is revolutionizing the human community a new perspective of community life must be found. Finding this new perspective is a lively interest among social scientists generally. For sociologists, however, it is a particular interest, because many of the problems involved lie within their field of inquiry.

In the urban community the change-compelling forces are not only most potent, they are also most varied in their forms and least predictable in their trends. This makes the urban community an intriguing subject for study and, however much it is studied, study must go on; because change goes on. Since there are different kinds of efforts to understand the urban community, different perspectives of the city result. This may be disillusioning for those who wish for only one answer.

The sociologist is fully ready to recognize that a perspective of the city developed by the engineer may differ from that of the anthropologist, while that of the geographer may be quite unlike that of the economist. Each serves a particular purpose and, while each tends to ignore the others, the sociologist is ready to take account of all perspectives, even those of the artist or poet. To the sociologist, the city is a human agglomerate living and working in the place it occupies.

An urban community is mass society, a chaotic mass as seen by some, but an organized, continuing community to the sociologist. Without organization, life could not move through the streets, messages could not be delivered, activity in hundreds of work places could not continue; indeed, the city could not feed itself for a single day. Such is the organization in all of its complicated aspects and this the sociologist will understand better.

In most developing countries the cities are still centralizing, with people and work piling up at the centre, while in the more developed countries cities are decentralizing. These differences have sociological meaning. There is sociological meaning in the ties between cities, towns and villages; indeed, a growing interdependence between city and country, each increasingly needing the other. Moreover, between cities scattered about the world there is evolving another interdependence which is global in character. This too is sociologically significant.

When we give the urban community a close look, as through a microscope, we find it is not merely a mass of people sharing a habitat; there is an order in this sharing, something like a division of labour in sharing space. This coincides in many respects with that other division of labour regarding of work. The sociologist finds that interdependence in sharing a habitat tends to be, actually must be, integratedness relating to work and living.

We have tried to describe industrial urbanism in terms of such recognized characteristics as high mobility and social mobility, transiency of contact, anonymity and impersonal social interaction, clock-regulated rhythm of life, man-made mechanized environment, egalitarian frame of reference and so on. We find that the social implications of these attributes are far-reaching. The influence of the city does not stop at its political border. It reaches out to change the way of life in every village and hamlet.

We recognize fully that urban characteristics differ from one world region to another, and may differ between cities within regions. Insofar as they are cultural differences, they are to be desired. Yet in terms of technology, economic organization and administration, industrial urbanism moves in the direction of global uniformities. This, too, is desired, since such uniformities serve to raise standards of living which need not encroach upon cultural distinctiveness.

In our view, global urbanism and global industrialism are combining as no other force in human history in bringing about a "one world" human condition. Science and technology become increasingly the universal property of all, much as the mode in dress, manners, tunes and dances enters the life of peoples everywhere at about the same time. Modern transportation and communication, along with the mass media—all aspects of urbanism—make neighbours of all peoples.

People have been living in cities for centuries, but the advantages and comforts of the old cities were monopolized by a small minority. Now comes a new trend, under way no more than a century, one that began in the industrial city; as men have been gaining political equality, they begin to demand and get both economic and social equality. The ways of work are being revolutionized by industry, and workers for the first time have leisure, already achieved in some countries, and it can be achieved in others. The term "leisure class" loses its old meaning.

The possibilities are in sight for more people of all classes to enjoy high levels of living and to achieve higher levels of education, to be employed and still have some free time and to be assured of a longer life span. These goals can be reached, although not without work, and much learning needs to be done. For the developing countries new ways of work may have to be learned, the better to utilize industry. The ways of industrial urbanism are not the ways of hard work, but the ways of making hard work easier

Finally, it must be said that these few brief chapters serve merely to introduce some of the more salient features of urban sociology. Indeed, all the subject could not be covered had we tripled the number of chapters. Urbanism is a big subject, and one that can never be fully described. It goes on changing even while the description is being written, which makes it the more interesting.

Memorial University
of Newfoundland,
St. John's, Canada.

NELS ANDERSON
K. ISHWARAN

CONTENTS

Introduction v

I Dimensions of Urbanism 1

II Community and Urbanism 22

III Changing Urban Popularity 39

IV Human Ecology and Urban Space 58

V Group Behaviours and Structures 75

VI Work and Leisure Under Urbanism 93

VII Government and Political Behaviour 110

VIII Social Welfare Under Urbanism 127

IX Social Control in Urban Society 145

X Utilizing the Physical Environment 165

Index 183

CHAPTER 1

DIMENSIONS OF URBANISM

NEVER in human history has such a high percentage of the world's population lived in cities, and never have cities grown at a faster rate. This growth will continue, perhaps in some regions for some years to come at a painful rate. These will be the countries now being industrialized where industry is changing the work ways of people, as urbanism is changing their ways of life. Urbanism differs from one world region to another. But where urbanism is joined with industrialism certain similarities and uniformities tend to enter the urban way of life While industrialism, as it becomes more global, tends to bring about similarities in the urban way of life, these do not necessarily detract from regional urban differences.

The urbanism of which we speak is not confined to urban places. It must be recognized as a way of life that tends to radiate from cities outward. This means that villages also come under the influence of cities. Thus, while cities grow in size, urbanism, the way of life in cities, spreads outward.

In this chapter we will take account of some of the characteristics of urbanism, comparing it here and there with that opposite, sometimes opposing, or resisting, but definitely older way of life, usually called ruralism. We will begin by considering in general how urbanism in the East and West differ. Of these differences we will continue to be aware throughout this study.

Urbanism, East and West

In the West the growth and influence of urbanism is more pervading than in non-Western countries, with the single exception of Japan. In general, the urbanization process in and around Eastern cities moved slowly until recent decades. Cities in Asia for years continued as centres of religion, education and administration, resembling very little the contemporary cities of the West. The old quiet balance is being disturbed by the ushering in of industrialism as these cities come under the economic influence of the industrially advanced countries, and as they too become industrial.

Besides, various forces of modernization are creating a gulf between the city and the country. This means that change in urbanism moves fast in the city and the city attracts from the country large numbers of non-agricultural rural people, leaving those behind who are practising agriculture. While the agricultural sphere changes slowly, the newly acquired industrial, educational and commercial civilization of the city develops rapidly with problem-forming consequences. About such developments in the urbanism of the East we need to have more knowledge.

This is the study field of urban sociology; not merely to gain knowledge about the city, because the city does not stand alone. Knowledge must be gained about the country, hinterland of the city and source of supply. The urban sociologist today recognizes that the complex larger society (city and country), if not already urban, is becoming urbanized. This is a necessary consequence of industrialization which, in developing countries leaves serious problems in its wake. The urban sociologist is aware that the technical, economic and social frontiers in our society, both East and West, expand with a new perspective. All of us are becoming aware of this, and so we come to see the need of more knowledge about our changing cities, any knowledge that helps us to understand this evolving industrial urbanism.

Cities in the East present contrasting features when compared with Western cities. They have been characterized by some as overcrowded villages still growing in a disorderly way. So it was of European cities at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution.[1] They do not seem urban at all to the urbanized Westerner. Including metropolitan centres, with few exceptions, Asian cities exhibit a lop-sided picture of development. Even at central areas there are the narrow streets, the space over-occupied with overcrowded buildings, often dilapidated; the congested market areas mixed with a haphazard growth of one-room tenements; slums littered with garbage and filth, all sanitary and hygienic principles being ignored; badly organized transport systems; inadequate water and electric supply and the like. All this has been told many times, but there is this to rejoice; urban people in non-Western countries are becoming aware of these problems. There is a growing interest in a scientific approach in dealing with them, a growing concern about human welfare.

Whatever urban social life in the West may have been in the year 1800, it is very different and it is very different from that in the East. Differences between the rural and the urban are disappearing in the West, but these differences remain sharp in non-Western countries. It would be difficult to compare rural-urban differences in the West with those in the East. It would be equally difficult to compare the urbanism of the townsman of Banglore or Poona with the urbanism of the Londoner or the New Yorker. Yet it is possible to make somewhat broader classifications of rural and urban features on the basis of structural and functional characteristics, and in these terms to explain urbanism as a way of life. Confusion sets in when the way or style of life in cities and towns is not confined to these places. It spreads, faster in some regions than others, and faster than the growth of cities.

Aspects of Present Urbanism

Community life is not new in human evolution; it would be difficult to imagine man living in any other way than in group arrangements. The size of the groups would be determined by the nature of the habitat and man's ability to organize his common activities. Human communities of some sort were here centuries before the most elemental cities appeared. These, it would seem, were places where people met periodically to exchange goods, as nomads return each year to pitch their tents on the same spot. But the history of the city as a community for work and exchange, also as a seat of political, military and religious authority does not date back more than seven thousand years.

Whatever the circumstances attending its origin and early growth, the emergence of the city was a decisively disturbing event in man's social evolution. It was the signal for people to be identified into one or another of two groups, rural or urban. Perhaps the distinction was vague and unnoticed for centuries. As the city evolved from being an elementary market for local exchange to become a complex market for wider areas, and as the kinds of work performed in the city increased in amount and variety, its urbanism became more evident.[2]

The urbanism we associate with towns and cities of today is mainly a social product of two or three centuries. It is in large part the cultural side of modern commercial and industrial development. Compared with the urbanism of the pre-industrial period, it is diversely unique. We may think of urbanism today as more informed and sophisticated, more technically oriented, more global in its perspective. The modern urbanized man is more aware of and has more knowledge about the wide world than was possible for his ancestors, even a few generations ago.

One aspect of modern urbanism is the readiness with which city people, compared with country people, accept change, and are not surprised even to be told of the most profound discoveries in science or the most extraordinary achievements in technology. Often this attitude is sustained by the matter-of-fact conviction that change is something to expect, and that somehow innovation and invention lead to social progress. This attitude tends also to be taken for granted, the acceptance of change being an old trait of urbanism. Had this not been true, cities could not have survived.

However, in many cities including metropolitan ones in the less industrialized societies there are visible evidences of cultural lag. While these cities move with the changing times, they have been successfully retaining the old values of life. Folkways and morse of the countryside still loom large in matters of family and kinship, religion and customary modes of life. Traditionalism, by and large, continues and is cherished by the people. Whether this habit of clinging to old ways will last long, in view of the revolutionizing forces of modernization, is not certain. No doubt for times to come these cities are destined to be the centres and carriers of change to the traditional rural areas.

Largely because of urban man's willingness to accept innovation and invention cities have been places of creativeness. Thus, the urbanite has been encouraged to feel himself superior to rural man, often holding him in contempt; a familiar trait of urbanism. The condition of rural man is normally not conducive to creativeness. His life is more coordinated with the annual cycles of nature, which are repeated with the seasons, from sowing to reaping and making ready for the next sowing. The uncertainties of urban life are those of the market, a-man to man relationship; those of rural life involve a man to nature relationship. Thus, urban man is more stimulated to be alert and resourceful, to create, which stimulation does not touch rural men with the same force.

Mainly because of continuous struggle for survival, urban man must be ready to meet new situations arising with each turn of events. He must be ever occupied with matters of the moment and immediate future. He too lives with his social heritage, but only so far as the experience of the past can be utilized. Had he been wholly tradition-oriented, cities would never have evolved as they did. He may hold fast to social traditions, as they relate to the family or religion, yet he readily sets aside work traditions which were the original basis of his social traditions. Thus, he tends to separate social traditions from the practical affairs of the day, especially as these affairs involve new work ways and new technics. Tradition denial, then, tends to be one of the traits of urbanism.

More Rural-Urban Comparisons

Ibn-Khaldun (1332-1406), Egyptian historian and philosopher, was one of the earliest scholars to write about cities. To him they were necessary for purposes of commerce and as centres of art and culture. The cities he knew were ruled by despots and seemingly it never occurred to him that there might be any other kind of urban government. He recognized cycles in the urban government of the Arab world. A tribal chieftain would capture a city, and his family would rule perhaps three generations, getting richer, lazier and more corrupt by the decade; also becoming weaker and less responsible in the process. Eventually, another tribal chieftain would capture the city, and the cycle would be repeated. Ibn-Khaldun, comparing rural and urban people, wrote : "Nomadic and rural people" are more healthy, more sound, more brave, more resourceful, more self-reliant, more independent, and more stern; less immoral, less degenerate than the urban people.[3]

Ibn-Khaldun might describe urban people more favourably today, but he would probably still make use of rural-urban comparisons. The two spheres continuously stand ar opposites. When rural sociology began in the United States it was in part an anti-urban movement with the aim of sustaining and improving rural life. Its motivations were defensive in behalf of the country against the encroaching city. This does not describe rural sociology today, a half-century later, or reflect the attitudes of most rural sociologists. Urban sociology began with a somewhat opposite orientation but the two sociologies tend more and more to become integrated in their motivations, although separate in their subject matter.

In general, rural sociology is focussed on the interests of a particular occupational group, the agriculturalists, making comparisons between these and the urban occupational groups. Urban sociologists have made their comparisons between urban man and rural man, which may be summarized in these terms :

1. The urban man generally is :
   - a. More willing than the rural man to accept risks ;
   - b. More ready to try new ways of performing his work ;
   - c. More cleverly on guard than the rural man in meeting strangers and more ready to match wits with them ,
   - d. More time-use conscious and more punctual in his appointments ;
   - e. More continually prepared for the unexpected in his daily contacts ;
   - f. More inclined than the rural man to think fast and to talk fast, taking care about where and when he talks and about what , and
   - g. More favourable to new songs and dances, and does not share the rural proclivity for repeating the old familiar jokes.

2. Also urban man usually is:
   - a. Less influenced in his choices by folk beliefs and omens than normally is true for rural man ;
   - b. Less attached to old work ways, old tools or devices ;
   - c. Less family-bound or submissive to kin outside his primary or nuclear family circle ;

d. Less an all-around neighbour than the rural man, also less likely to be involved in long-standing feuds with some neighbours ;
e. Less inclined to join with relatives and friends in borrowing or lending things, or in the exchange of work ;
f. Less devoted to customs and traditions, particularly ceremonial customs and traditions of family and neighbourhood ; and
g. Less addicted than rural man to the use of old folk sayings and stereotyped forms of speech.

It often happens that persons of rural origin who settle in towns and cities, once adjusted to urban life, are quick to accept and voice these ways and attitudes. Such adaptation is often slower for older than for younger people, particularly in developing countries. The old act as brakes to the young in their reluctance to abandon age-old rural cultural elements in favour of the urban: a generation may be needed for some changes to take place. Left to the natural course of events, generations may be needed for some changes to take place, unless deliberate attempts (education, persuasion, coercion) are made in the direction. The generation born and brought up in an urban environment would doubtless be more imitative of new modes in dress, hair style, even to methods of family planning; yet there would be reluctance to give up attachments for family, kinship, church and so on.

However, in countries which are most urban in their life and most industrial in their work the traditional rural man is disappearing. Rural people in dress, ways of speaking and thinking, as in their interests become much like urban people. This tends to be true in all countries as rural people have more contacts and more kinds of contacts with the urbanizing influence of cities.

Dominance of Urbanism

Our interest is less in rural-urban comparisons than in the nature of rural-urban relationships. It is generally recognized that in this relationship the urban role is dominant. One evidence of this is seen in the age-old moral judgments among rural people about the city. They compare to the rationalizations of the poor man who reasons that, although he has less wordly goods, his way of life is more virtuous than that of his rich neighbour. He is likely to describe the life style of the wealthy and well-born as one of painful conscience, if not also of ungodliness and immorality. Country people are prone to regard urbanites as people who work less, but have more than a fair share of the world's good.

Urban dominance must not be seen as the result of accident or good fortune nor is it due to any intrinsic superiority of urban over non-urban people. It is more logically a consequence of a difference in the two situations, rural and urban, and the different requirements of these two supplementary roles, which really reinforce each other. Together, they constitute a division of labour, which at times in history the city dominated by the rule of force. This dominance could never have evolved on the basis of force alone; there had to be substantial reason for it. Urban exploitation of rural people is still found in some regions, although not in the more advanced countries. The rural-urban exchange of goods and services, so necessary to this division of labour, never prospered under a system of urban exploitation.

City-centered domination of this rural-urban economic relationship does not necessarily mean urban exploitation. The dominance is typified by the folk expression, "When two men ride a horse, one must ride behind."

The rural-urban division of labour is one that meets in the market place, and the market place, for practical reasons, is urban. The market is an area or regional facility, normally located at a point most accessible to the greatest number. The size of the market is determined by the market area that it serves, and the nature of the market is determined by the kinds and amounts of goods and services exchanged there.

It is the market that brought the city into existence, conditioning its character and growth. Much that is said about urban dominance grows out of its market function in the rural-urban division of labour. Actually, the city becomes a cluster of special markets, the number and variety of which increase with the growth of the city. Each market is a reason for particular kinds of activity for particular kinds of workers using tools or machines to make things or to perform services, or for persons who dispense advice or different kinds of knowledge. In the ancient city there were workers in leather, wood, metals. They made cloth or sewed cloth into garments. They made pottery or glass. These were traded for rural products, but later sold for money. People were needed to regulate the market or to serve those who came to sell or to buy, and others were there to entertain them.

With the evolution of the market, traders came to sell or to buy. Goods were carried to the market, other goods were carried away. Besides the services and the entertainment for strangers, there were the physicians and magicmakers to heal the sick and to reassure the worried. The scribes and money changers were there. With all of these kinds of work, markets grew into cities in which activities became institutionalized. This became urbanism which became dominant over ruralism. The characteristics of urbanism are many, but the five which we will now consider are sufficiently descriptive. They are : (1) the money economy (2) written records, (3) invention and technics, (4) administration, and (5) cultural innovation.

The Money Economy

We know that the urban market existed a long time before money came into use. It was not needed so long as the market served a limited area, with no distant commerce. There was a recognized authority for regulating weights and measures and for adjusting disputes. There were recognized rules for knowing the values of things exchanged ; how much fruit or vegetables had to be given in exchange for a sheep. or what in exchange would be paid for an ox or a sack of wool brought to the city. The stranger from far places rarely appeared in premoney markets ; his appearance was the main reason for introducing some medium of exchange, such as metal coins. Such symbols representing the value of goods and services could be carried away in lieu of the bulky merchandise. Money values could be carried through time as well as space, and could be used later to pay for goods or services.[4]

To serve such purposes, money had value only if sustained by a fairly stable and continuing authority, while the authority needed a fairly permanent abiding place. Moreover, the authority had to be strong enough to inspire feelings of sureness, as it also had to at least pretend to be fair and just. For its functioning this authority needed organization, that is, persons performing services in the name of the authority. Apparently, one of the first reasons for making and using money was to make the market available to strangers. It became a device for the creation of invisible values, useful for long-distance commerce. Through the use of money, a small city in a limited market area might become a large city with a wide market area. The using of money and the growth of confidence in it led to its being used not only for rural-urban exchange, but for transactions between rural people.

We speak today of rural people being "on the subsistence economy" if they do not use money. That is taken to be a sign of agricultural backwardness, since in most countries, advanced and developing, farmers are "on the money economy." Farmers on the money economy are to that degree urbanized, using exchange symbols that originated in the city. The subsistence farmer exchanges things for things, mostly within a personal acquaintance area, or he exchanges work for work or work for things; the values he cannot carry in his pocket as on the money economy. In the city the use of money permits some to accumulate wealth, which becomes a means to personal power.[5] This enables the city to gain a position of dominance.

Written Records

Through the use of money and with the growth of long-distance commerce came the need for communicating information, for writing, for making use of paper. A man far away came to be known by his seal or his signature. Agreements came to be put on paper. Thus came into use documents, the "instruments" necessary for commerce. Agreements between friends as well as between strangers have come to be agreements in writing; insurance against the faults of money, the uncertainties of life, and temptation. The written agreement or contact could come into force because the city itself had become a civil body governed by law, a basic community contract.

With each passing century the city had become a more complex human agglomeration, more impersonal in its life and more committed to the use of written records. As the authority of the king insured order and fair dealing in the pre-money market, so the city when it became a civil authority insured order and fair dealing under provisions of written law. Among other services, it assumed responsibility for the integrity of written contracts. With the entry of written records into human relationships, came also a transition in the nature of community life. Maine, well over a century ago, described this change as a transition from "status to contract," from memory agreements and memory law to written agreements and written law, from purely personal relationships to those that could be impersonal.[6]

Without written records the industrial urban society could not function, critics of things as they are have sometimes cried out against the increasing use of paper, without which they themselves would not be able to participate in community life, unless we returned to the old subsistence economy. "To deprive ourselves of paper," says Mumford, "would ruin the world quicker than universal flood or earthquake."[7] The entire life of the urban man can be traced in records from his birth certificate to the certificate of death. Between these certificates are school records, work records, records for each serious illness, records for each violation of the law, tax records, records of each purchase and sale, so on without end. This is another trait of urbanism and it would be difficult to enumerate the many ways our daily routine is influenced by what is written on paper.

In many ways the written record performs for man a security function, a convenience function, but if the written record is not to his credit, it can be a source of great inconvenience. This is recognized by all, even those who protest about the excessive use of paper, the written record is an instrument for maintaining order in the complex industrial urban community. Whether public or private records, they are mostly made in cities and mainly kept there, safeguarded through time. And this also is pertinent, as rural man learned to use money, so he has been compelled bit by bit to make use of written records.

Invention and Technics

At different points in the chapters ahead we will take notice of invention and technics; here we consider these concepts for the character they lend to urbanism. As already noted, urban man must be resourceful to survive, because for him the risks and exigencies of life which compel resourcefulness have ever been more numerous and varied, if not greater, than for rural man. Even if only indirectly, he too must face uncertainties of natural origin. He also faces the problems of population increase and, in addition, certain unique problems growing out of the competitive urban situation which stimulate inventiveness.[8]

Like other parts of the social heritage handed down from the older to the younger generation, invention is cumulative. There are two kinds of invention, very much related and both are cumulative: (1) things or technics, and (2) social forms, words, skills. It is mainly in the use of technics that improvement possibilities are seen (to make the tool or machine more efficient or the procedure more exact). The ship, for example, has a long history, which is one largely of an accumulation of hundreds of inventions. Many that have been superceded have disappeared (sail superceded by steam propulsion).[9] The same may be said of the automobile, the apartment dwelling, the hotel, book making. Technical accumulation is accompanied by a cumulative learning process.

On the other side, the compulsion to invent gives rise to serious adjustment problems. Some feel advantaged by the machine civilization, others are made uncomfortable. High occupational specialization and concomitant competitiveness, individualism, egalitarian attitudes, impersonal relations, all pose particular problems—loneliness, nervous tension, deviant behaviour. Of these the urban sociologist becomes increasingly aware, and about them he is getting better informed. Despite some disadvantages of urban living, for some more than others, the city with its opportunities for education, its diverse employments, its modern amenities and comforts, continues to initiate invention and innovation. It becomes increasingly the great magnetic attraction for the ruralist.

Some are prone to say that technical invention and regimentation go hand in hand. This is akin to saying that urban society is itself mechanized by the mechanisms man creates for his practical needs. The same could be said of man in the stone age. The difference is that technics today multiply at a faster rate, demanding continuous adjustment. Man is more stimulated to invent than ever and the very process of creating stimulates further invention. When he invented the bicycle, he began at once to improve upon it. So it has been with hard-surface roads, with the automobile and almost every kind of machine.

Social inventions often come with the new technics. The automobile brought about the auto accident and automobile insurance system, traffic control system, new patterns for spending a holiday, organizations for the distribution of oil and petrol More than that, in some regions the automotive vehicle is bringing about a redistribution of population and industry.[10]

Administration

Man is a special kind of learning animal, because when he will he can learn by systematic effort. In the course of human history he has been learning at a faster rate, in particular during the past two or three centuries. When we look closer with a critical eye, we are impressed with the slowness of this mass learning. We find that some of the most obvious lessons held out to man by experience are long disregarded. This applies especially to a tional ordering of his affairs. On the technical side, he goes ahead inventing and building, but social inventions for bettering life in the city he builds come slowly. There has ever been a lag in creating the institutions needed for mass living.

A further examination of this thought leads to the conclusion that cities in ancient and medieval times were not quite so urban. Often they were an aggregate of villagelike clusters, each internally controlled. Or streets assumed the character of villagelike neighbourhoods. Pre-industrial cities had their organization. There was a single civil authority and a single church authority. Also there were those work groups, the guilds; a guild for each kind of work · woodworkers, makers of leather, shoemakers saddlers, clothmakers, tailors, barbers, smiths for working iron, gold, silver; so on through merchants, priests, medicine and magicmakers. Each guild was a closed, intimate, primary group, often crowded into a single street. Each such group, workers and their families, isolated itself within the city, used traditional work tools and ways, behaving much as a village. Cosmopolitanism was found in only a small inner circle around the seat of authority. Civil government was not needed and even when it existed was used only in a limited way, mainly to regulate relations with the outside.

Civil government, as a means for administering a wide range of community affairs; street maintenance, private property control, fire and police protection, pure water supply, sewers, health and welfare services; a government used by the people to do things, this did not emerge until after 1800. Urban man has been slow in learning to handle his public affairs. The art of impersonal public administration was slow to be conceived and slower to be put into practice. By this we mean administration free of family control and the domination of non-rational folkways. Henri Saint-Simon (1760-1825) is credited with being the first scholar to propose a scheme for the effective bureaucratization of government. It remained for Max Weber, half a century later to formulate a rational theory of bureaucracy.[11] This does not mean that no advance had been made in public administration between Saint-Simon and Weber, only that the idea of rational administration had not been explored. The Weberian model of systematic, impersonal, rational bureaucracy applies as much to urban as to national government. It also applies as much to the administration of a private corporation as to a public department, or any organization requiring system and order in managing its work.[12]

A rational administration with integrated procedures is a prime essential to any organization, public or private, which must be operated with predictable efficiency and without favour or prejudice. Where aggregates of people concentrate for reasons of livelihood with a great variety of interdependent work interests, the administration of affairs must be precise, punctual and predictable. Contacts extend beyond the family sphere into the world of strangers, which is the city. Rational administration assures that in this milieu strangers can deal with other strangers in a secure atmosphere. In such a situation the villagelike organization can serve some purposes, but certain relations, highly essential for the individual's living are beyond its capacity. It is to serve this purpose that private impersonal organizations are found in the mass society.

Such organizations, also called voluntary associations, often obtain charters under law and become legal persons; a manufacturing enterprise, a consumer cooperative society, a sport association, all these must be rationally administered under the same basic rules that hold for the modern city itself. On this subject more will be said in other chapters. The concept is included here as one of the traits of urbanism, along with the money economy and written records.

Cultural Innovation

We have spoken of urbanism as being in a dominant position in relation to ruralism. This does not mean "better", as some seem to think, nor does it mean "superior." It means only that the role of urbanism is different, and the urban situation is more stimulating for change. Individuals, as they are personally affected, will have different views about the superiority or inferiority of the rural or the urban in any particular. Of this we are fairly certain; the trend for change moves mainly from the urban to the rural. However much ruralism may change under the influence of urbanism, the two spheres tend to remain distinct; each tends to remain "in character." The flow of influence, however, is not entirely from urban to rural. In different ways ruralism interpenetrates urbanism.

There is also, particularly in developing countries, a "counter urbanization" flow of influence, even while villages are taking on urban ways. There has always been a tendency for rurals migrating to the city to retain their rural culture and in times of mass cityward migration this influence may be considerable. In countries where urban people move to the country to live, although working in the city, they tend to be exposed to rural influence. Social distances are less than in the city and in these "urban" areas of contact anonymity is absent, people not being overly separated geographically, rural and urban traits come freely into contact; thus the country transmits influence even while assimilating urban influence. One may notice the sophistication of folk culture in the fashions of city dwellers; in their customs and costumes their ornaments, music and dances. Some have called this process where rural and urban meet on even terms as "urbanization." It goes on mainly in the sphere of leisure and social activity, rarely in the work sphere.

Rural and urban, parts of the same society, participate politically in the national government, although not always equally. In some states of the United States rural representatives outnumber urban representatives in state legislatures. The apportionment was made long ago when the cities were much smaller, but now urban people are in the majority, but the proportions in the legislature do not change, the rural legislative majority will not consider change. Here is rural dominance by a small rural minority, which imposes legal hardships on cities, and which, until adjustment can be realized, serves as a counterbalance to urban economic domination.[11] Rulings by the United States Supreme Court early in 1964 will require an adjustment of this rural—urban legislative imbalance. Because of their ruling the political position of cities will gradually become stronger, perhaps to the political disadvantage of some rural areas. Such rural dominance makes it difficult for some cities to develop effective transportation systems in metropolitan regions, or to secure from rural areas an adequate water supply. Nor does rural dominance in the political sphere interfere with the spread of urban technological influence and that means the cultural consequences of technology.

From the above we can make this generalization : As the city grows and as its technology evolves and its economy expands its influence radiates outward. This may mean that its dominance radiates outward also. This outward spreading may meet with rural resistance, but the resistance, while it may slow up the rate of outward influence, does not stop in. Urban culture goes on changing and spreading.

This is no better illustrated than in the case of the clock, an urban invention which had to be developed in order to perfect other basic mechanisms. The clock was needed to meet various time-precision demands of urban living. The evolution of the clock and man's adapation to it has certain cultural implications. It becomes the regulator both of machines and systems of mechanisms, of man's appointments and his tempo. These cultural adaptations are evident in different collective behaviours, in language as verbal behaviour, in types of social groupings, as well as in beliefs and attitudes. These traits of culture, received from the previous generations, are changed somewhat by the existing generation and passed on to the next to be changed some more. The change is often called innovation.[14]

Culture develops as man learns to live with his environment, including the elements in his environment of his own making, these may modify the natural environment (heating systems in houses, artificial light, mechanical power, long-distance communication, artificial fertilizers). The clock is one of the unique creations of man's mechanized environment. Like the automobile, it enters into many phases of life. Man carries a mineature version of the clock in his pocket or on his wrist. It determines the duration of an appointment and may even cut short an interesting conversation. The whole culture must adapt to it in some measure, since it helps determine what one has time for and what must be excluded. It orients man in time as the automobile orients man to space and distance in ever new ways.[15]

Because life under urbanism is preoccupied with continuous innovation, it is also characterized by continuous cultural change. It is a way of life characterized also by a continuous pursuit of capability and knowledge, which is stimulated by the fact that most universities, libraries and museums are in cities. The learning process also goes on under ruralism, but with less urgency. Naturally among the urbanites, some are more concentrated on learning than others. The few may be active in science, technology, philosophy and so on, while the many seem not at all concerned about this kind of achievement, but the many are no less urbanized.

Those who live under urbanism must participate in another kind of learning. They must learn to use the mechanisms with which they come into daily contact the private automobile, the public transport system, telephones and other means of communication; elevators and heating systems, cooling and ventilating systems; many kinds of electrical equipment in homes and work places. They must learn the ways of behaviour in public places, also how to get on with public departments and private organizations. All must learn to perform in certain roles that each must perform in the day. The urban environment can be dangerous to one who is strange to it. And this learning that all must have is not achieved once and for all; the environment continues to change and the learning must also continue. This is the realm in which collective learning and cultural innovation take place, and this is what gives urbanism its sophisticated and cosmopolitan flavour.

Urbanization

When we speak of urbanism as the style of life of the city, we assume by implication a style of life for the village. When we speak of urbanism as dynamic we tend to associate with this dynamism a radiation of urban influence. The most telling evidence of this dynamism is that it never has confined itself to the city. We have already expressed this thought and already indicated that it has been this outreaching which has enabled the city to live and to grow. If the city cannot grow, or at least extend its influence, its dynamism is likely to decline.

Urban growth is usually identified as urbanization, and it means : (1) the movement of people from rural to industrial residence, and (2) the movement of people from agricultural to non-agricultural work. This use of the term takes account of the more visible aspects of urbanization. It is something that can be measured when the census of a country is taken every decade or so, which is highly useful.

There is another type of urbanization which is not so easily measured, but it may well be more important than the movement of people into cities and into industrial employment. It concerns the outreaching of urban influence, which is realized in various ways : (1) rural people visit the city or live there for periods of time; (2) urban people visit the rural places; (3) urban-produced goods and services are distributed to rural consumers; and (4) rural people exposed to urban influences tend to influence one another. Over radio and television as in the cinema, rural and urban people listen to the same programs, hear the same jokes, learn the same songs, in general get the same information. In the public schools rural basic education is very similar to the urban. Rural and urban people often read the same newspapers and even the same books. In terms of dress, language and manners the rural worker and the industrial worker tend to be more alike.[16]

This type of urbanization, which permits the farmer to become urbanized without changing his occupation is of interest to both the rural sociologist and the urban sociologist. Especially is this true in such countries as Belgium, Germany and Holland, as in Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries, where agriculture is becoming less a way of life than an occupation. The way of life in the village has already become urban. It may happen so ultimately in developing countries.[17]

CHAPTER 2

COMMUNITY AND URBANISM

THE objective in the previous chapter was to call attention to the more salient characteristics of urbanism as a way of life, the life style of the city. These were compared with the rural style of life. Reference was made to the urban community, but it was not defined. An effort will be made in this chapter to define community and to take account of some of its characteristics.

Images of the Community

Scholars in the social sciences are sometimes troubled because terms they use frequently attain popularity, and when this happens the terms come to have a variety of meanings. When a term gains popularity it means that it relates to something in which there is considerable interest. This is disturbing to some scholars because they want the words they use to have specific meanings and no other. They may try to invent terms that will not be garbled and misused, but if they succeed, the likelihood is they have only a few readers.

"Community" is such a concept that has come into the public domain, which means that it belongs to all and it may have quite unrelated applications. Examples are: "community of nations," a "community of interest," the European Coal and Steel Community. An ethnic or religious group in London, New York or Paris might call itself a community. It may have a central point as headquarters, but its members would be widely distributed.

Some sociologists would be happy to find a more exact term instead of community, but there is none. However, we do not think that the various meanings of the word "community" detract from its usefulness. Any writer using the term needs but to make clear what it means with respect to his use of it. The same would hold for such terms as village or city. It does not matter, then, if a sociologist, a social psychologist and a geographer design three different definitions of the same community, unless the three are working on a single research, in which case the definition would be made to fit the situation and problem under study.

Another pertinent observation about definitions is the old notion that a definition should be "critic-proof." Formerly more than today scholars in the different social sciences wasted much print space debating each other's definitions. Even today the occasional writer before presenting his own definition, will hold up several others for examination. This is pertinent because there have been several studies in recent years in which definitions of community were collected and compared. For urban sociology this pursuit of definitions loses value once emperical research into the problems of the community begins.[1]

For our purposes, the community is an aggregate of people organized in a diversity of meaningful functional relationships and occupying a particular geographical area. For the urban community these relationships would be primary and intimate or secondary and impersonal, or a combination of primary and secondary. The character of a particular community would be determined by the number and types of people living there, taking account also of their means of livelihood. Whatever the means of livelihood of an urban community, the collective behaviour of the total aggregate would be characterized by types of interdependence, sufficiently complete to meet the ordinary needs of work and living. Moreover, it is assumed that the life and organization of the community are such that they afford a variety of opportunities for social and other types of participation. It is also assumed that this diversity increases with the size of the urban community.

Seen in the perspective of time, the community is a continuing phenomenon, and changing as it continues. It is the total of all the experience, all the knowledge and all the skill of all the people living there. Much of this experience, knowledge and skill is a collective property because it has been shared in the past and it being shared in the present, although the people may belong to different ethnic, racial, economic and social classes. Evidence of this aspect of community is the ease with which a million people can share a common habitat, live in its many habitations and perform in its many work places. These relationships imply a great variety of commitments against the future; education of the young, maintaining social insurance programs, setting aside funds for future replacement or for rebuilding. The community is, then, the totality of all these relationships and all the meanings inhering in them.

Actually, without people there is no community. It is the people plus their organization plus their properties. People without organization do not make the community; that would be merely a crowd, and without people and organization the property has no meaning. In one sense the community is a collective image in the minds of the people, even though each individual may have a somewhat special image of it. The totality of these images and the totality of behaviour makes possible the transmission of the social heritage. Obviously for these people who are the community, the kind of community they are, is largely determined by the physical environment, the natural resources and other geographic aspects of the habitat.

Communities, City and Village

All the basic community characteristics which may be associated with the city are also found in the village; they differ only in detail. Although this is usually admitted, it is sometimes insisted that the organization of the urban community is more complex. This is true or not, depending on how complexity is defined. These views were earlier associated with ideas about social evolution all things evolve from the simple to the complex. So it was assumed for all parts of culture.[2] Now it is recognized that although a less advanced people may not possess the knowledge and technics of an advanced people, their culture is not simple; being complex in its own way. Whatever is needed for life and work in that situation will be present. In this sense, the rural village lacks none of the elements needed to meet the "basic and acquired needs." The difference comes when we compare the tools and machines used traditionally by the agricultural worker with those of the worker in industry.

In the urban community the artifacts, behaviours and other cultural elements found in the village have been added upon. Language and communication become more sophisticated, but no parts of speech (noun, verbs, adjectives, etc.) are added. Vocabularies are enlarged and means of communication are developed. Transportation systems of greater carrying capacity and speed, comfort and reliability, stand in place of animal carriers. The essential groupings for the sustenance, safeguarding and continuing of the community expand into a greater variety of groups in the urban community. In the city are groupings of a secondary nature, needed for living in the impersonal milieu, although hardly needed in the village.

Mainly because of the number of people, making urbanites strangers to one another, most of the contacts of the urban man's day are impersonal and transient. He may see certain persons every day but never get to know them, or wish to; as he may know other persons very well without having met them in person. Such he would know through correspondence or telephone conversation. Such anonymity and impersonalism would not be accepted in the village, although a convenience necessary for urban living. Anonymity makes it possible for a degree of freedom and privacy, but the wish for privacy might be regarded with suspicion in the village. This is one among several reasons that an individual can more easily change his occupation or his status in the urban than in the village community. The outside pressures which hold him to a fixed social status or identify him with a particular occupation are not so strong in the urban community. In the village he may inherit both his status and his occupation, which is also possible to some degree in the city.

Whereas urbanism tends to acquire a similar character from region to region, with respect to technics, structures and matters relating to the mode, villages in the same region may differ very much. This trend toward urban similarity need not and seldom does deprive cities of their regional cultural uniqueness. Bombay, Calcutta, London, Paris have their similarities, but each retains what some have called a "personality" reflective of its region and history. The uniformities are usually of a kind necessary for the effective use of mechanisms and structures, not so much related to the social and cultural aspects of living. Village communities also have their traditional ways but, again, there may be similarities from village to village. However villages within the region of a great city differ from one another, all come under the same influences from the city. This gradually makes for uniformity. If there are differences, they would depend on the nearness of a village to the city as on the number and variety of contacts. Understandably, suburban villages come to be as urban in life style as the city itself.

The Rural-Urban Continuum

Is a village in which the inhabitants walk, talk, dress and otherwise deport themselves like urbanites really a rural community or an urban one? In the old days when cities lived within walls and the gates were closed at night, it was the wall that divided rural from urban. Such an ancient city was like a house for its inhabitants, or a self-isolated island. With the coming of industrialism, cities could no longer be retained within walls. Then the walls were an inconvenience; access being more important. Cities turned from building walls to making roads. Today it is almost impossible to draw a line between city and country, or to know where the urban ends and the rural begins. Students both of urban and rural sociology are largely in agreement that the rural community not under urban influence would be hard to find. On the other hand, there is no urban community without a considerable share of people of rural origin not yet fully urbanized. In other words, the rural penetrates into the city as the urban penetrates into the country. We can, however, visualize communities as ranging from the most urban to the least urban. The purely urban and the purely rural would be abstractions at the opposite poles of the "rural-urban dichotomy." This range between the extremes is called by some the "rural-urban continuum," also a theoretical concept.

One difficulty with the rural-urban continuum is that it has not been statistically verified. For sociologists who believe nothing that cannot be counted or measured, this "continuum" is a fiction. A study has been made in Bengal with results not yet conclusive by Mukherjee. This research is still under way. We find the idea of continuum not at all "romantic." In Western regions the evidence of observation tends to support the idea that villages having most contacts with the city tend to be more urbanized than those with least contacts. It would vary with the urbanity of the city and the rurality of the country.[8]

Duncan made a test of towns and villages in the United States in terms of certain characteristics of population (occupation, level of education, women in the labour force, per cent of married males and females by age groups, size of primary families, fertility ratio, median income, etc.), but he found no evidence of the rural-urban continuum. His study failed to take into account one important consideration; distance of the small place from the city and its accessibility to the city; all places of given size were lumped together, the near and the far.[4]

Obviously, places that are easily accessible to and have frequent contacts with the city will be more under its influence than places that are more remote and have few urban contacts. In this example we see that, while the extremely statistical approach may be helpful to urban sociology in some respects, it may be a hindrance in other respects. Other research methods must also be used.

Communities at Work

Communities come into existence for practical reasons, they are places of work. Even a pleasure resort visited almost entirely by people on holiday, where catering to leisure has priority over all other activity, is a work place for people living there. It is work mainly that gives a community its character and in terms of work the occupations of the people are determined. The educational level of the labour force and the educational aspirations of parents for their children will relate to the prevalent occupational prospects. A national capital in which there is little manufacturing will have few artisans and common workers in its labour force, compared with an industrial city, but there will be a high proportion of white-collar workers, and the level of living is likely to be higher than for a factory town. In countries where the climate is congenial, certain scenically situated non-industrial places come to be known as retirement towns. Much of the work done in such places will be for the health and comfort of the aged. The tempo and atmosphere of a retirement town would be slower and more quiet than for a vacation resort.

The industrial importance of the Ruhr District of Germany is well known. This is a region where coal and iron meet in making steel. Smoke in the air forces the housewife to work hard to keep things clean. In the Ruhr may be found a great variety of manufactures making a wide assortment of articles from metal. Each city in the Ruhr tends to specialize in some type of metal work; heavy machinery, precision machinery, household wares, tools and instruments, etc. This explains the high proportion of skilled metal workers in the labour force of this region, but the composition of the labour force varies a little from city to city. Some industries are interrelated with others, with the result that there is considerable interdependence between cities in the Ruhr. We find the same in England's industrial region, called the Midlands.[5]

There is a multidimensional relationship between the work of a community and the characteristics of its labour force, its level of education, its standard of living, its level of social structure and its level of cultural appreciation. The more highly industrial and urbanized the community becomes the lower will be the percentage of unskilled workers in the labour force and the higher will be the productivity of the individual worker.[6] When an urban community becomes metropolis, so many kinds of work are likely to be performed there that it cannot be classified, but there may be great diversity in occupation as between areas within the metropolis. Thus a metropolis, Bombay, Paris, Tokyo or other, assumes a regional or supercommunity aspect a community of communities.

Community Internal Organization

Cowan describes the community organization of the Ibo tribes in Nigeria as being without a central authority, although one exists in the background. Each village includes a number of linear or family groups and each linear group has its own authority and its common ancestor.

> With rare exceptions, the largest political unit was the village group, united only by the slenderest social ties, sharing a common meeting place for a market and for political discussion. Each village acted as an autonomous unit in the political structure, except when the threat of invasion or other calamity brought about united action. Even within the villages decentralization of power was pushed to its

> extreme. There was no single chief, authority being split up between the kin groups making up the village. Such village affairs as required common action were discussed by a council of elders whose head was the chief of the senior lineage.[7]

In such a village, the reverse of the urban community, the extended family is the all-purpose organization for getting things done, and doubtless an efficient one for that kind of situation. Each individual has his niche in a kin group and the kin group gets his first loyality, the village being an outside organization. Nath made a similar observation about Indian villages where, other unifying forces being absent, the village breaks into lesser units organized on the basis of caste.

> But even in areas where the tightly nucleated village is the settlement unit, it is often found that the houses of members of different castes concentrate in different sections of the village . In my view, the multicaste villages—most villages in India are multicaste—should more appropriately be called the "secondary community" because the feeling of belonging represents the first extension of the primary loyalty to the smaller unit mentioned above.[8]

As a matter of fact, the internal organization of village communities in India presents a bewildering variety of networks of intra-group and inter-group relationships and solidarities. The village community is an isolable entity in asmuch as it is a part of the wider society Its unity as an isolable unit is reinforced by family, kinship, caste, ritual complex, and territorial affinity. But these determinates are so varied and complex that it becomes rather difficult to give a detailed account of them. Contrary to popular notions, it is the elementary family, and not the joint family, that is the basic unit of the village social organization. Recent studies of Indian villages demonstrate the dominance of the elementary family and the survival of a very few large joint families, which typically are identified with the upper strata of society. It is characteristic to note that in some of the North Indian villages where, even if a linear group shares a home in common, for all practical purposes, they live as members of the independent elementary family. They have their own hearths and independent ways of earning and expenditure; although such occasions as births, marriages, deaths, litigations and so on may unite them temporarily.

Truly, it is characteristic of rural villages in India that the very determinants like family, kinship and caste, which reinforce their isolable entities to a greater extent, are equally responsible for the emergence of inter-village communities, thus enabling them to form a part of wider society. When these determinants are responsible for the membership of a smaller group—linear group, factional group or a neighbourhood within the village—such a group preserves its distinctiveness by means of local traditions, values and, for that matter, ethos. When these smaller groups within the village merge with the wider society the cultural traditions of the wider society bring them together enjoining them to live in accordance with the prevalent norms.

In his well-known study of "Plainville," West found various neighbourhood clusters, although the structure of neighbourhoods was much less stable than would be those of family or caste.[9]

As we shall consider in Chapter 4 on urban ecology, city people also tend to cluster in separate areas but often for other reasons; social class, race, ethnic origin and, of course, rent levels. We know from our studies of ancient and medieval cities that families with particular occupations tended to cluster in certain streets; the work place of the worker was his home. Modern industry separates the work place from the home and streets tend less to be the neighbourhoods of special craftsmen. In this separation or work and home, the modern urban community not only has areas of residence but areas for types of work.

The village, usually being a folk community, the family often being the main work unit, divides normally into lesser units. Notwithstanding the tendency to divide, the village usually unites in the face of disaster or some emergency. The modern suburb is often a village community which also tends to divide into various loosely identified neighbourhoods. There may appear to be little evidence of village consciousness. However, at election time, if there is an issue between the city and the suburbs, this village may suddenly appear united. Such unity may not be a matter of common interest at other times.

The Neighbourhood Ideal

In certain countries there is some concern among community leaders and students of urban life about the apparent decline of the neighbourhood. Behind this worry there is the ideal that normally and traditionally even urban families have lived in neighbourhoods, that the neighbourhood is a desirable way for families to share a common habitat. Some people think it is a social duty to be a good neighbour, to know and be friendly with others living near. Organizations are sometimes formed to promote "neighbouring," the idea being that, because there is so much anonymity in urban milieu, it is good to promote the spirit of community in the small area where the urban man lives. With such purposes in mind, city planners often endeavour to plan housing projects in such a way that dwellings will be clustered around small central areas in which will be located the essential shops and institutions. It is assumed that people living in such an area will come to know each other and there will develop among them an atmosphere of community.

For understandable reasons, mainly related to poverty, people living in the slums of industrial cities in the West showed little interest in evolving the neighbourhood way of life. In order to encourage this interest in a local community life, the settlement movement began in some of these industrial cities during the 1880's, a movement that has since become worldwide.[10] The slum conditions have changed materially since the settlement movement began. Cities of the West still have what are called slums but there has been a vast improvement since about 1830.[11]

In the United States among those who promote the neighbourhood ideal there is the notion that the old-fashioned rural community was a model place to live. Now it appears that with the expansion of urban influence the old-fashioned rural neighbourhood is declining. This is clearly seen in a study of Devereux and associates of a rural area in New York. Also the "neighbouring" habit is vanishing. Here are a number of reasons for it :

1. Most of the stores in the village are branches of store-chains owned by city people, and the bank is a branch bank. The managers in these establishments are city people, at least city trained.
2. Most of the social, recreational, patriotic, business and other associations to which the people belong are branches of national associations, all of which have their central offices in big cities.
3. Formerly each neighbourhood had its elementary school but today the children are taken by bus to consolidated schools.
4. Most village churches have closed, mainly because farmers have their automobiles and prefer to attend church in a larger community.
5. Industrial workers from the nearby small city where they are employed are moving into the village or building their homes near it. They are not of the village community and do not identify themselves with it.

Devereux describes a rural condition which is general in those regions of the United States that are most urban and industrial.[12] This thought must be added; the old-fashioned rural neighbourhood was probably not the place of harmony and mutual helpfulness, as imagined by some who promote the idea today. A good share of the young people were glad to migrate from it to the city. It was often the scene of bitter inter-family rivalries. Not infrequently its life was dominated by some two or three of the most prominent families. One reason for this interest in reviving neighbourhood life is the belief that, unless people live in such non-private communities they will drift into immoral ways of living. The all-seeing eye of the neighbourhood helps to press people into the ways of approved conduct.

Urban Social Networks

The urban man may be very well integrated into his community, but it is not the village type of integration. He has his nuclear or elemental family and the family has its network of contacts with friends and relatives. The network of kinship and friendship of the urban man may include persons living in various parts of the city, while few or none of these may be neighbours. He may not wish to be too well acquainted with his neighbours. This urban man may be a good citizen, a steady and reliable worker, an ideal family member, a responsible member of one or more voluntary associations, yet he may be an indifferent neighbour. He needs the city and he is adjusted to it, but he feels no great need for the neighbourhood. He may feel that to be a good neighbour he must concern himself about the affairs and worries of people who have no claim on him except that they live near him. If he is to give time to others he prefers to give such time to his friends who may or may not live near him. The neighbourhood ideal assumes that proximity of residence and friendship must go hand in hand.

The children of the urbanized man may have more contacts in the neighbourhood than he and his wife together; indeed, the children may be the means of drawing the parents into various types of community participation. The children, therefore, are likely to be more inconvenienced than the parents if the family moves to another neighbourhood. But as the children reach adulthood their networks of contact will also become citywide.

At any time the persons in the contact network of the urbanized man tend to identify him with a social class and an occupation. If he rises to a higher occupation he may endeavor to add persons of higher status to his contact network, some of lesser status may be faded out. If he descends in occupation and income, others may tend to demote him in their networks. The contact network of the urban man changes too as he moves through the cycle of life from youth to old age.[13]

The urban man and his wife, his children as well, face the problem of using their time in work and non-work activity. Contact with friends and kin is reserved mainly for leisure or non-work time. The amount of such contact the urban man has in the course of the year is limited and he must "ration" it out. He gives most of his time to those contacts that mean most to him. Some contacts he can afford to neglect, others he dare not. This means that the number of contacts one can handle during the year is limited. One learns the fine art of keeping his contacts and keeping them in place. He clings to his friends, or releases himself from them, for a great variety of reasons, and these reasons change with changes in his social status, as he gets new intellectual interests or as he ages.

The idea of the social network is not a substitute for the idea of neighbourhood. The urban man who likes the idea of being a neighbour must also have his social network; it is necessary for his integration into the wider urban community. The main difference between social contact network and neighbourhood is that one can move to another neighbourhood and still retain his network contacts, but he must get acquainted with new neighbours, an intriguing idea for some, but not all. The social contact network is much less spatially fixed and much more adapted to the mobile, fluxing life of the city.

For the urban man whose occupation does not change and who may be employed for years at the same work place there will be correspondingly few changes in his contact network. More than likely most of the contacts in his network will be known to one another. Such has been described as a "closed network," and is one that exercises a neighbourhoodlike control over the individual, although few of the contacts in his network will be neighbours. At the other extreme is the cosmopolitan urban man who may have such a variety of contacts that few of them know each other. His would be what has been called an "open network."

The network concept is described here somewhat in detail because it may serve as a useful approach for urban sociologists who would get more knowledge about social interaction in urban life. It is a subject on which little research has been done. It is, moreover, an opportunity for joint sociological and socio-psychological research into urban behaviour.

Community Process

Culture, viewed as a living and changing phenomenon, has been characterized by some as a social process. The central idea of social process, a term put into the sociological vocabulary by Cooley,[14] is that the body of culture with which we are living has flowed in large part out of the past, and is flowing on. We can think of the community as an onward flowing of relationships. But we can also think of it as a process which man can manipulate and guide to some degree into desired directions. That is being done all the time by all sorts of institutions, some of which take their model for the future excessively out of the past. Community life as a process is no less than the totality of behaviours, as noted at the outset of this chapter.

The social process is characterized by particular types of intergroup relationships. For example, the urban community includes people of many kinds; occupational, racial, ethnic, religious groups and others. However the individual may be identified with such classifications of the urban population, he must have relations with other kinds of people as he preoccupies himself with earning his livelihood. His being identified with one group or another may in different situations be a handicap or an advantage. He competes for his living both as an individual and as a member of a race, religion, class, age group and so on. The normal relationship in the social process of the city is competitive, as in the village, but the milieu of the city is more impersonal and especially is that true of the urban labour market. This market tends to select on the basis of ability, not social class; on the basis of job needs, not family background. But "because people behave like people," even in the city the individual meets sometimes with discrimination regardless of his ability to identify himself with the social process. This prompts persons of different social, economic or other identifications to form their interest groups, which tends to convert the social process into a competitive relationship between organized groups which often cut across the old lines that divided people.[15]

Disorganization and Progress

Seen in relation to social change, the community social process is one of renewal and replacement, acquiring and discarding. This can be seen in the study of language, workways or social values, as in the properties of the urban community. It would be interesting to learn how many words had to be put aside, how many were given a new meaning and how many new words were added when modern man turned to the automobile, so when he turned from candle or oil light to electricity. Between electric power and piped (hot and cold) water in buildings, architecture had to accept a revolution, while old buildings were more outmoded than ever. The old kitchen is replaced by one more efficiently equipped. The office in the business district that was modern in 1863 would be laughed at in 1866. These and other changes tend to disturb established ways and relationships. Some have called it disorganization; a condition that exists until adjustment is realized. But change goes on and so must adjustment. Whatever terms we use; disorganization and reorganization or disintegration and reintegration, the double process goes on continuously in the urban milieu without organization being thrown out of equilibrium.

Many people like to use the word "progress," another term social scientists avoid because it is so variously used. It implies that in the course of community change the social process is being guided towards desired goals, that to some degree the desired goals are being attained. It was called progress when the automobile came into practical use, but workers who had to find other occupations had another name for it. When many one-room small schools were closed in favour of a few big, well-equipped consolidated schools, that was called progress, but it was not progress to the old-fashioned teacher who did not qualify for a job in the more sophisticated consolidated school. Viewed a generation later, both the automobile and the consolidated school would be recognized as marks of progress.

Actually, much of the change taking place in the urban community is not guided and it would be difficult to agree upon principles for guiding certain types of change; for example, as it affects the home and the family. Most efforts to guide such change are in the direction of restraining it, holding it to the traditional forms. Also there are types of change going forward without being noticed , the advent of leisure, for example, in the industrial urban countries. The coming of abundant leisure was not called progress. Whether it means progress for the urban community or not is now controversial. It will probably not be controversial a generation hence. It may be hard to say what progress is when we view changes in the social process now under way. However, it is not difficult to identify progress when we compare 1863 . We would find the measure of progress in lower death rates, as in higher levels of living and of education for the total population. It would concern the opportunities for women to obtain education and equality in the labour market, the quality of housing for workers and other such evidences of improvement.

CHAPTER 3

CHANGING URBAN POPULATIONS

THE city contains not only "many men of many minds;" the minds are prone to change, so the men are of many kinds. The rural population of a particular district is normally one of fewer strains or breeds of people than any urban population. The more cosmopolitan a city becomes as a market, the more cosmopolitan its population tends to be and the more diverse the activities of its people. The extreme of population mixtures will be found in such world cities as Bombay, Calcutta, New York, London, Tokyo, a widely-known fact. Our interest in this chapter is on the types of people in urban communities and some of their characteristics, and we will compare rural and urban population for some of these characteristics.

Cities and their Food Supply

For a mixture of related rural-urban reasons, the composition of urban population continues to change. If rural population increases but land supply does not, the surplus must find employment in non-agricultural occupations, either in the village or in the city. Before the rise of cities, if there was too much population pressure against the supply of food-producing land, the numbers were reduced by disease, starvation, perhaps by war. Cities afforded relief for such pressure; at least they created the illusion of relief, so people have crowded into them. Their growth, usually stimulated by crowding, has rarely been sufficient to accept all who would migrate from village to city.

Cities have been called "destroyers of population" because often they have been visited by killing plagues. If not the plagues, before the city learned to keep itself clean and healthy, it was a variety of diseases that killed the urban people, in particular the children. At long last these diseases are well under control and the city becomes more the conserver of human life. This life-saving knowledge spreads to the villages, so there may be a faster rate of population increase.

The city is also called a "consumer of population" because, as is well known, upper-class urban families tend to die out and middle-class families have fewer children. In Australia, Canada and the United States it is not unusual for families to move from lower to upper class in one or two generations. This upward movement of families and individuals in Old World cities may be slower, but it is far from absent. Usually upper-class families tend to die out, which makes the city a "consumer" of population, which in turn makes room for newcomers.

If the people in cities and the new arrivals do not find existing means of employment, they are stimulated to develop new employments, to be inventive and creative, making things to sell or they find new money-earning services. However, directly or indirectly, they must secure their food from rural people, from the same food supply they would have drawn upon had they not migrated to the city. Here we find an area in which urban inventiveness reacts to the benefit of rural people, but this applies more particularly to the modern city. It has been through this inventiveness that most types of farm machines, new vehicles as well as new farm tools came into existence. Thus agriculture in many countries has become more productive. Science has enabled the production of chemical fertilizers in abundance to increase crop yields. Through scientific experimentation, breeds of cattle and other stock have been improved, and more productive types of grain, cotton, corn, vegetables and fruits have resulted. These are urban contributions that benefit agriculture.

The improvement of transportation and communication, enabling urban markets to reach global dimensions, make it possible for urban people to draw their food supplies from a great variety of sources. Food produced in any region is available to people in all world regions, something hardly possible a century ago. This access to the world's food supply has enabled cities to grow, and this increasing access applies to more than food. It takes in raw fabrics, woods, metals, rubber, oil, etc., which enables cities to have more work processing these raw stuffs.

Obviously, the total food supply of the world is pertinent to the size of cities and their work; but the more complex and global this supply system becomes, the more hazardous becomes urban existence. The flow of supplies, raw materials for work, and food, must be continuous. Great hardships may result if this flow is interrupted even for a week. The larger a city becomes and the more global its contacts, the more precarious its condition if the flow of materials and food is interrupted. So long as technical organization (transport, communication, food processing) operates effectively the subsistence level of the city is secure. It can supply itself through its far-flung networks; which is both ideal and illusory. It is ideal so long as the flow is not interrupted, and illusory because it creates a false sense of security vis-a-vis the global food supply. Many are lulled into forgetting that the world population is increasing faster than the food supply.

Urban Preoccupation over Population

Population study is the special field of the demographer, who is interested in much more than the mere increase or decrease of population. He looks also at other kinds of change; distribution of population by recial or ethnic groups, the ratio of males to females, the age distribution, birth rates, death rates and so on. There are different rates of births, marriages and deaths for different categories of the population. The demographer has a special interest in migration because this changes population compositions in places of emigration as in places of immigration. In general, demography takes account of all population changes and their locations, kinds and classes of people and their occupations. Its approach is necessarily statistical and is only one approach for the sociologist.

The sociologist takes account of demographic findings, as he does the findings of ecology, geography, economics and other sources of information, insofar as they contribute to understanding the behaviour of people. Behind or beside other forms of behaviour, he sees social behaviour, the interaction of people in all sorts of relationships. For example, the demographer finds that generally rural birth rates are higher than urban birth rates and the expectation of life of industrial urban people is longer than for agricultural rural people. The sociologist recognizes that these differences reflect different ways of life and work in city and country, which in turn affect birth and death rates.

Demographers are also much interested in urbanization, the movement of people into cities, and the transfer of people from agricultural to industrial work. They remind us that urbanization and industrialization need to be in balance. Rapid urbanization and slow industrialization leads to mass unemployment. This is also of interest to the urban sociologist, as he is also interested in the composition of the labour force. The urban sociologist must go on to take account of the occupations and types of work, levels of living for diverse categories of labour, housing conditions, problems of education and health, family life, etc.[1]

Population change is a problem for most countries. Some countries are concerned about the low rate of increase, their populations are aging. Other countries are concerned about an excessive increase. A few countries of high increase, India, for example, have instituted population planning.[2]

In some countries the migration of people tends to be a problem. In some developing countries much of this moving about is aimless wandering, people unable to subsist in their places of origin (or they are not wanted), move about looking for a place to settle. Demographic information about such mobility is often difficult to get, although it is needed for public and private administration purposes. The growing city needs to provide facilities for additional people; water supply, sewage, housing, school facilities welfare. Private administrators need information on population change, since it relates to changing consumer demand, the relocation of the labour force, and there are other practical considerations.

The vital necessity of demographic research in developing countries was abundantly brought out by a 1954 survey of cities in India by the Research Programmes Committee of the Planning Commission, Government of India. Socio-economic studies of cities like Baroda (Gujarat), Hubli (Mysore), Hyderabad (Andhra), and a few others representing various states of India were surveyed. These reports clearly demonstrate lack of planning and foresight, particularly regarding the growth of industrial, metropolitan centres. Social scientists who did these studies are unanimous about the need for an effective control of internal migration, prevention of slums and sprawls, and implementing family planning. Since rapid industrial urbanization is inevitable in Asia as in Africa, it is paramount in the decades to come to check the unplanned and haphazard growth of cities, and to guide urban development in favour of man and his welfare. This calls for much research.

German cities have their statistical offices for keeping a continuous inventory of births, marriages, deaths, migrations, divorces, accidents and illnesses. This inventory concerns the employment of different types of labour, houses built and other items of information essential for municipal housekeeping. Each year a summary report is published. Cities in other countries are following this example which one day will be common practice in developing countries as well.

Population, Rural and Urban

Approximately 13 per cent of the world's population in 1950 lived in cities of 100,000 or more. In the United States and Canada it was about 30 per cent, while for India seven per cent of the population were in cities of 100,000 or more, compared with about half of the population in the United Kingdom. Actually, 80 per cent of the British were living in cities of 20,000 or more inhabitants. So many British have become urbanized that agriculture has become a "protected" occupation, farmers being paid subsidies for producing crops. Migration is more away from British cities than toward them. London has become less a city than a region with regional water control regional transportation control and a regional police force. The farmer's son trained for urban employment does not need to migrate, but can ride to his work place in a bus. The situation is similar in Belgium, Germany, Holland and Scandinavia.

An opposite condition is found in France where the administration of all urban places as well as villages is centralized through the prefecture system in Paris. Most of the elites in France live in Paris, where also is concentrated a sixth of the French population and a fourth of the nation's industrial labour force. Robertson notes that the average income in Paris is 80 per cent higher than elsewhere in France, which means that the urbanizing of rural areas has moved slowly compared, for example, with Germany and Holland.[3] For over a century Paris has absorbed much of the population increase of France.

In Australia, Canada and the United States where the British concept of community independence prevailed, cities grew as they were able. There was no national policy, as in some countries to artificially centralize either political or economic power. If some grew faster and larger it was because of greater access to natural resources and markets. Thus, centres of urbanization were widely distributed. Cities grew and attracted population as they were favoured by location and natural resources. This freedom of cities in Australia, Canada and the United States may help to explain the rapid urbanization of the population in these countries, compared with such an old country as France. By 1960 American rural people, except in small isolated areas, had become completely urbanized. By 1963 the labour force had reached about 64 million with only about 15 per cent of the total in agriculture.[4]

It is not possible to determine in a highly industrial urban country precisely what proportion of the labour force is actually in agriculture. Where industrial employment is near, from a fifth to a fourth of all small farmers work some of their time in non-farm employment. Adult members of the rural family may be living on the farm but working regularly in industrial employment.[5]

Moreover, for statistical purposes, "urban" and "rural" tend to be arbitrary designations. In India, for example, people living in places of less than 5,000, or those in the United States living in places of less than 2,500 are called rural while those in places of larger size are called urban.[6] It is well known that some people engaged in agriculture are found in so-called urban places and in so-called rural places will be many engaged in non-agricultural work.

Countries differ in the degree to which they have been urbanized, also in the degree to which they can be or need to be urbanized. This applies no less to developing countries where rapid urbanization is under way and where strenuous efforts are made to advance industrialization. If there is a limit beyond which industrial development cannot go, that would tend to limit urbanization. In such cases more effort may be needed to raise the level of agriculture, in Congo for example, which might provide rural employment and increase the food producing capacity of the developing country, no less important than providing industrial work. A country with an ample land supply might have a balanced economy even if 60 to 70 per cent of the population were in agriculture producing for world markets.

Populations by Age and Sex

Studies in different countries over a considerable period indicate in general that urban population, at least in the industrial countries, are younger than rural populations. Of 1,000 Parisians in 1901, 271 were under 20 years, 649 were between 20 and 64 years and 80 were 59 years of age or older, but the respective figures in 1936 were 204, 681 and 115. These were Paris figures assembled by Landry. Chombart de Lauwe found that of rural in France as of 1910 each 1,000 included 272 under 20 years, 538 between 20 and 59 and 190 of 59 or older.[7] Apparently Paris attracts people in their active years, while some of the older ones return to the village.

For the United States as of 1950, Bogue found the rural and urban distribution of people by age seen in Table 1. The rural nonfarm group includes persons living in places of less than 2,500 inhabitants who are not engaged in agricultural work (merchants, mechanics, urban workers, retired persons). The table does not confirm the idea that urban people, at least in the United States, are younger. However, for the active years the urban proportion (63.8%) is a fifth higher than for the rural farm population.[8]

TABLE 1

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE UNITED STATES POPULATION BY URBAN AND RURAL RESIDENCE, 1950

Life Cycle groups	*Urban*	*Rural nonfarm*	*Rural farm*
Childhood (0 to 8)	16.7%	20.5%	20.4%
Youth (9 to 17)	11.4	14.6	19.0
Adulthood (18 to 64)	63.8	56.3	53.0
Old age (65 years and over)	8.2	8.6	7.6
Total	100.1	100.0	100.0

The kind of work performed in urban places tends to be reflected by the age and sex distribution of their populations, although other factors may determine in a country with high unemployment. Browning made a study of cities in several world regions, comparing them statistically for a number of population characteristics. From this group we select two, each quite opposite to the other : Geneva, Switzerland (156,900 in 1950) and Colombo, Ceylon (426,127 in 1953). As seen in Table 2, Colombo has a higher proportion of children

TABLE 2

AGE AND SEX OF INHABITANTS IN TWO UNLIKE CITIES

Indices	*Geneva*	*Colombo*
Age groups		
0—14	12.9%	30.5%
15—64	69.1	66.7
65 and over	18.0	2.8
	100.0%	100.0%
Dependency ratio[*]	41.7	49.9
Median age	41.9	24.5
Sex ratio[*]		
Total	80.6	154.8
0—14	102.4	105.6
15—64	82.1	189.6
65 and over	62.7	101.2
Per cent male		
Total	44.6	60.8
15—64	45.1	65.5

[*] The dependency ratio is the result of (0—14) plus (65 and over) divided by (15—64). The sex ratio is the number of males per 100 females.

under 15 years (30.5% to 12.9%) but the proportion of old people in Geneva is more than five times that of Colombo. The median age in Geneva (41.9) is about half the work life of a man longer than for Colombo (24.5). Note the high proportion of males to females in Colombo (154.8 to 100) compared with Geneva (80.6 to 100), and the still higher proportion in the working age group (15-64) for Colombo compared with Geneva. Colombo is a more favourable labour market for men as Geneva is for women.[9]

Except as unskilled factory workers, women were consistently excluded from most types of urban employment until recent decades. They were utilized as household, servants and permitted to become teachers but as soon as a woman married it was expected that she would give her time to family and housework. The first important break came in World War I when women were encouraged to enter different employments "for the duration of the war," but many did not return to housework only when the war ended. During World War II in the United States most barriers were set aside.

Bopegamage found in Delhi a sex and age distribution, as seen in Table 3, which compares somewhat with that of Colombo, and here we note that the population in this city is younger than the generally rural Indian population and here also the sex ratio is high, about 131 males to 100 females.[10]

TABLE 3

AGE AND SEX DISTRIBUTION IN DELHI, 1951

Age groups	*Male*	*Female*	*Total Delhi*	*All India*
Under 4	11.2%	8.3%	19.5%	13.5%
5—14	12.7	9.2	21.9	24.8
15—34	20.5	14.6	35.1	33.0
35—54	10.7	6.4	17.1	20.4
55 and over	4.0	2.4	6.4	8.3
Total	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%	100.0%

The population composition of Indian cities presents this distinguishing characteristic; an inordinately high proportion of children under 15, and a still larger number of adult male population in the 16-45 age group. For children under 15 we see these figures as percentage of total population in six cities :

Kanpur	37.7	Gorakhpur	41.6
Lucknow	38.4	Hubli	42.1
Poona	39.4	Jamshedpur	42.9

And for children under 14 as per cent of the total urban population, we find these figures. Bombay, 36.7; Baroda, 37.9; Hyderabad-Secunderabad, 38.9; while for Surat it is 39.0. We see the gravity of these figures when we compare them with those of the United Kingdom where children under 15 comprise 21 per cent of the total population. At the other extreme, one is impressed with the high figures for persons of 55-56 in Indian cities, which are in sharp contrast with figures for the aged in cities of the West. Note the 55 or 56 years and above age-group in these cities; the percentage this group claims of the population in each city :

Poona	4.0	Surat	8.1
Bombay	6.1	Lucknow	9.0
Baroda	7.3		

It is expected that within a few years the figures for old persons, now forming 12 per cent of the total population may rise to 16 per cent.

In general, Indian cities have a long record for an excess of males to females. The following figures show the number of females per hundred males in seven cities :

Hyderabad-Secunderabad	98.1	Baroda	89.8
Hubli	97.4	Bombay	86.2
Surat	96.7	Gorakhpur	84.7
Poona	93.5		

This disparity ranges from 102 males per 100 females in Hyderabad-Secunderabad to 118 per 100 females in Gorakhpur. It is phenomenal in that in some cities it has continued year after year. Poona, for example, has had a shortage of females since 1901. Calcutta, with the reputation of being the man's city of India, as seen in Table 4, shows an excess of males for each age group, with the highest disproportion for

TABLE 4

MALES PER 1,000 FEMALES IN CALCUTTA, BY AGE GROUPS

Age group	*1954-55*	*1955-56*	*1956-57*	*1957-58*
0— 4	1,180	1,118	1,121	1,083
5—14	1,101	1,075	1,129	1,171
15—59	1,934	2,183	2,037	2,375
60 and over	1,231	1,358	1,362	1,402
Overall ratio	1,595	1,706	1,658	1,876

each year shown in the table for the 15-59 age group, which is a partial measure of the excess of males over females among those entering Calcutta in search of employment.

Of the urban studies sponsored by the Planning Commission, Dhekney's survey of Hubli alone registers an excess of females over males, but only for the Muslim and Christian communities within that city, and the differences are minor as between age groups.[11] The disparity between the sexes is greater in larger cities, and it is greater in northern and eastern cities than cities in the southern and western parts of India. The disparity leads to social problems; for example, it is said that 10 per cent of employed women in Calcutta earn their living by prostitution.

Natural Increase and Migration

The birth rate of a people minus their death rate equals their natural increase, but in some cases increase or decrease is largely due to people moving into a community or out of it, into or out of a region. Either natural increase or migration may be different for different categories of the population. A decreasing category (middle or upper classes, for example) may have a higher age level than an increasing category. Moreover, the lower socio-economic classes, being less secure, are likely to be more mobile than the not-so-poor classes. Such mobility, if into the city, is often due to the illusion or promise of economic opportunity, which usually also means worse conditions in areas of origin.

Population increase may be due to a combination of migration and high birth rate, often true of rural migrants to Latin American cities. Casis studied the child-woman ratios for seven Latin American countries; that is children under four for each 1,000 women between 15 and 49. These were the ratios found:[12]

Cities of 100,000 and over	352
Cities of 10,000 to 100,000	412
All cities under 10,000	649

Little difference was found in birth rates as between countryside and small urban places. Latin American cities are growing rapidly. Brazil's cities grew by 70 per cent between 1950 and 1960, while the rural population increased by 18 per cent.

Mexico's population increased from 16,552,722 in 1930 to 34,923,129 in 1960, a gain of 110 per cent; while the urban population increased from 5,540,631 in 1930 to 17,705,118 in 1960, a gain of 219 per cent. With this great movement into cities there has also been a high natural increase, due largely to the migrants.

In the United States the number of children under five per 1,000 women of child-bearing age, as estimated by Duncan and Reiss for 1950 were by size of place :[13]

Cities of 3,000,000 or more	433
1,000,000 to 3,000,000	478
10,000 to 25,000	525
2,500 to 10,000	570
1,000 to 2,500	609
Rural nonfarm	717
Rural farm	766

A country that maintains a high rate of population increase, especially if it is also afflicted with high unemployment rates may find itself as much discomfited by a low death rate as by a high birth rate. The death rate in the United Kingdom is about 11 per 1,000 population and it is not likely to go much lower in a country where the expectation of life is about 70 years. The birth rate in the United Kingdom is about 15 per 1,000, compared with about 30 for India.[14] We can well imagine how the population problem of the United Kingdom would change were that country to have for a period of ten years the birth rate of India. On the other hand, we can imagine the population problems that would rise were India to achieve suddenly the lower death rate of the United Kingdom plus the 70 years expectation of life of the people in the United Kingdom.[15]

Urban Growth Prospects

At different times in the past when even the strongest cities in some lands lived behind walls, it was a standing policy to resist growth. Today cities try to grow and the bigger ones look down on the smaller, but this urge to grow is less a concern of cities with dominant status in their regions. The big cities continue to attract people of different classes, races, occupations and ethnic origin. Actually the big city is likely to take more pride in its cosmopolitanism than its size.

It is often true that certain people in cities work hard to make their town grow more, to make their town more important, to bring to their town more credit and, of course, more wealth. These addicts of "bigger and better" are often convinced that bigger is equal to better, a satisfying kind of self-deception. Some deceive themselves to the extreme of believing that any small urban community can become both bigger and better if it is resourceful and works hard. If a city does not grow bigger, they are quite ready to argue that the fault lies with the people living there. They would agree that a small city is one of backward people. While such thinking is basically false, it is correct in one particular; namely, the big, growing city tends to attract people from small cities with little prospect of growth. Actually, the size of a village, town or city is determined by the resources available and the size of the market it can reach. It may be able to enlarge these possibilities, but not beyond the natural limits.

What is more important for our look at the urban community is the extent to which the people of a country are urban and the growth trends of urban places. In Britain 82 per cent of the population lives in urban places and about 95 per cent are urban in their source of livelihood. Here is a country that has about reached saturation. Questions about the prospects of urbanism in Britain concern the movement of urban people into or away from big places, middle-size places and so on. India is a country in which about 21 per cent of the people live in places of 5,000 or more, but Australia, a very new country, highly industrial, has about 66 per cent of its population in cities of 5,000 or more. Table 5, taken from Gibbs, shows the nature and extent of urbanization in Australia and India and is inviting for speculation. It is not likely that Australia will become much more urban. India 27 times the number of people living in cities is only half as much urbanized as Australia. The number of cities in the different classes for India; in fact while this is being written the number of cities in the 100,000 class are growing and changing and the same would hold for the other classes.[16]

Australia did not begin as a country of small farmers. Commercial agriculture has been the rule from the outset, much of it mechanized. India, on the other hand, faces the prospect of becoming much more urbanized, but first it must become much more industrialized. Until it becomes more urbanized and industrialized it will be difficult for its agriculture to be more mechanized and modernized; large surpluses of population must be moved from rural areas. Each development depends on the others.

TABLE 5

URBAN PLACES IN AUSTRALIA AND INDIA BY CITY SIZE NUMBER OF PLACES AND PER CENT OF TOTAL POPULATION IN EACH CATEGORY OF CITY

Size of urban agglomerations	*Pop. (thousands)* *Australia*	*India*	*Per cent pop.** *Australia*	*India*	*Number* † *Australia*	*India*
2,000-4,999	588	59,109	7.8	16.6	190	20,508
5,000-9,999	361	20,754	4.8	5.8	53	3,101
10,000-19,999	327	11,681	4.3	3.3	23	856
20,000-49,999	374	11,804	4.9	3.3	11	401
50,000-99,999	77	7,555	1.0	2.1	1	111
100,000 and over	3,894	23,551	51.4	6.6	6	73
Total	5,621	134,454	74.2	37.7	284	25,050

* Per cent of National population in each class of cities

† Number of cities in each of the classes.

It is well recognized that this growth of urbanization for India is essential to relieve pressure on the land and to improve the adverse economic conditions that afflict India's rural areas. About 82 per cent of her population still live in 558,000 villages and 72 per cent depend entirely on agriculture for a livelihood. With the average farm size per farm family at only two and a half acres, one needs no better evidence of land crowding. There is migration to the cities, often to the point of pain, as the figures for these cities suggest :

Percentage of population increase 1901-1951 for :

Poona	370
Hyderabad Secunderabad	242
Hubli	216
Baroda	213
Gorakhpur	206
Lucknow	194
Surat	187

Percentage of population increase 1911-1951 for :

Jamshedpur	3826
Kanpur	379

These figures for growth are already old. All of these cities have continued to grow at even a faster rate since 1951. Evidence of this growth is seen if we look again at Table 5 above in which 73 cities were reported in the 100,000 class. The number had increased to 113 by 1961. This growth is due to continue with small prospects in the near future for control or guidance. Nothing could be more needed in this situation than control and planning.

Population Quality and Control

We do not need to wait until the regions of the world have been fully urbanized to recognize the pertinence of the increase of population to the world's food supply. Population pressure in cities and mass unemployment are continuous reminders that there is no food abundance, except of certain products at certain times in certain areas. But the fact that cities have global access to whatever food there is, encourages some to believe the problem does not exist.

Let us assume this hypothetical example. Suppose for some reason the benzine supply in the United States were exhausted, rendering useless the 65 million motor vehicles. To do the work of that many vehicles at least 300 million horses would be needed. If that number of horses would be made available there would still not be land enough to produce food for them, except as other food-producing animals were drastically reduced in number. In 1900 there were horses for all needs, but the population has tripled and the standard of living risen since 1900. If the present population of the United States reaches 200 million within the next decade we can be sure the cost of animal food will rise and food producing animals will begin to diminish in number, as wild animals have virtually disappeared.[17]

Many well-motivated people firmly believe that, whatever the population growth, man with his science and technology will find a way to produce the food needed. Man has done much in this direction, but the possibilities are not endless. In some areas where he has made great advance (grains, fruits), the prospects of further advance become increasingly limited. There is a limit also to the possibility of bringing new lands under cultivation. The optimist answers, "We will get new foods out of the sea, or may be out of the air." These are also possibilities, but limited ones.

The other approach is to control the number of population through family planning, which is being done by certain classes in some countries. In wide regions people do not have the necessary knowledge for voluntary control. Religious groups are often opposed both to giving such knowledge and using it. Public policy in many countries is opposed to providing birth control knowledge, even if people desire it. A few countries (China, India, Japan, Puerto Rico) have adopted educational programs for family planning and birth control. Such programs must be supplemented with educational programs before they can become effective.

Some fear that family planning programs may fall into the hands of organized groups, or be influenced by certain men of science advocating the idea of selective birth control. There is the notion that certain human types are superior to others and should be encouraged to reproduce themselves at a faster rate than would be desired for other human types. One common difficulty with such notions is that their proponents tend to identify superiority and inferiority in terms of cultural and acquired qualities rather than innate, biological qualities. The desired qualities they find in the advantaged classes. The intellectuals are often convinced that the unlettered man is inferior, and some racialists believe that people of other races are inferior. Unfortunately, such notions are often presented under the guise of science and paraded as scientific.[16]

The idea of selective population control might lead to serious consequences if some version of it entered the creed of a dictator government. It is well to remember that urban peoples generally are regarded as superior to rural people, but it must not be forgotten that for centuries urban people have been rising out of the rural population. The grandfather of the poet or musician may have been a stolid peasant; the grandfather of the engineer or professor a simple fisherman in a primitive seacoast village. That stream of humanity from country to city has been flowing for several thousand years, and continues to flow, else cities could never had gained such vigour.

Family planning and birth control as a public policy may serve well in relieving population pressure against the food supply. It could be damaging to the human race if it became part of some quality-selection scheme. The proper insurance against such a development is more and more scientific knowledge put into such form that it becomes part of the culture, knowledge that everyone knows, as people are learning the simple rules of hygiene in caring for babies.

CHAPTER 4

HUMAN ECOLOGY AND URBAN SPACE

For rural man the space value of a unit of land is mainly determined by its worth for the production of food, but this unit of land may have greater value if it is near a city or market than if it is remotely situated. The worth helps to determine whether the land will be used *extensively* for field crops of grazing, or *intensively* for fruit or vegetables, a chicken farm or dairy. The more expensive the acre of land the more intensively it must be used.

Once a piece of land is taken for urban use its food-producing value disappears. It is no longer used to produce food ; it has become space and it does not matter whether this unit of space is one of rich soil, of sand or even a wet marsh ; its worth is determined by its location with respect of the centre of the city where land has its highest value. Its urban value depends on its use for some urban need.

Rural man also has other uses for land, besides producing food. He must use space for roads, his house and the farm buildings for his produce and live stock. Considering all uses to which land may be put, all are not equal. Some take precedence over others, which means that uses compete with one another for units of space within the urban area, which holds also for rural land. This special distribution of land is an ecological matter, and we speak of human or social ecology, or of rural or urban ecology. Some aspects of ecology will be examined in this chapter.

The "Natural" in Human Communities

Students of human society and behaviour often seek to find a connection between man and his environment. The geographer asks questions about the location of a community with reference to the facts of geography ; why one community is small, another large, why one kind of work is done in this community and another kind in that one. Geography, Theodorson notes, emphasizes "the direct relationship between man and a physical environment, the effects of the total topography upon man and man's modification of his physical habitat."[1] The more technically advanced a civilization becomes, the more man is able to modify this environment. Some geographers with a special interest in cities call themselves urban geographers.

Human ecology is closely related to geographic study, although its focus is different, being somewhat more microscopic than geography and more concerned with the uses of space within a geographic area. As ecology is used by sociologists, it is often identified with a group of sociologists at the University of Chicago, and for a time was a controversial subject among sociologists. Ecological research is today engaged in much more at other universities than Chicago. Curiously, India is one of the few countries outside the United States in which sociologists have shown an interest in human ecology. It is more a method than a separate scientific discipline and as a method it can be used as well by economists, social psychologists, anthropologists, administrators and planners.

Through the ecological approach we learn about the distribution of functions or types of space use; residential, manufacturing, transport, recreational, business, public service; information that can usually be placed on maps. It is information that concerns locations, distances and access; as a rule, practical information that officials, administrators and other practical people can understand and use. The "natural" aspects of human ecology concern man's adaptation to the "lay of the land." If he will have a city in which to live and work, he needs to adapt his city so it fits into its physical setting. Where Bombay stands was once a cluster of hills with low land between the hills. The hills were levelled and the low land made higher. This was not possible for Rio de Janeiro where the city had to make itself at home along a narrow coastal area. Stockholm had to settle itself on bits of land surrounded or partly surrounded by water. New Orleans had to build a high dike to protect itself against overflow from the river. Yet each city found a way to carry on all its necessary functions within the space available. Moreover, each city goes on growing and changing, calling for changes in the use of its space.

Boskoff notes that the seeming chaos of an urban community vanishes, once the ecological pattern of space use is visualized. Thus one sees order in the distribution of institutions, properties and groups. It also makes clear in terms of space the complex urban division of labour. "If ecological organization is a human product imperceptibly constructed from antecedent social processes, it is also a set of conditions that effect in some measure the daily decisions of individuals and groups in the routines of community functioning. Thus, knowledge of the ecological organization provides the essential link among past, present and probably future developments in the community."[2]

One criticism of human ecologists is that they are trying to adopt the concepts of a science which relates mainly to plant and animal life. There is indeed competition for space and food among plants, as there is among animals. In the same habitat plants compete both with plants of other species and their own. Each to survive must have a fair share of food, water and sunshine. Species that can no longer compete are replaced by others that can. Thus *competition* and *succession* are also related to more than human society. Plants or animals may enter the habitats of other plants or animals, which is called *invasion* and the invading species may finally establish *dominance* in its new habitat.[3] In such terms man is said to behave naturally as do plants and animals.

In the world of nature there is interdependence as well as competition, and there tends to be a balance between different kinds of creatures, but man in overrunning the earth tends to disturb the balance of nature. In the Kaibab forest of Utah near the Grand Canyon of the Colorado there was a balance between deer and mountain lions who lived on the deer; the numbers of each were limited by the numbers of the other. When hunters killed most of the mountain lions the deer multiplied in excess of the grass supply. The hunters now kill the number of deer each year which otherwise would have been eaten by the mountain lions.

Urban man competes for the units of space that he can use most advantageously for his different purposes. He may want the space for residence which is most conveniently located for attractiveness, social prestige and within the highest range he can afford. He definitely wants to occupy work space that is both convenient for himself and others where he can work most profitably. Man; a thinking animal with his technology, has learned to multiply space in central areas of most-demanded location by erecting tall buildings. He can increase the efficiency of living in his habitat by diverse divisions of labour, but he still must make adaptations to limited space.

The Human in Human Ecology

The human community in terms of some observers is largely unplanned and its evolution is undirected, although it is based on economic relationships in which each individual makes such choices as he can as he rationalizes his own interests. If he cannot eliminate competitors, he must find ways of sharing the situation with them. If he cannot operate independently, he may find it expedient to enter into interdependent relations with others. Instead of isolating himself from his competitors, he may find it more profitable to cluster with them. Thus, we may find the furriers clustered in some side street. They work as individuals and each garment they make is an individual creation. They manage to work in small space. Their raw materials and finished products, although of high value, need little space. If more spacious work rooms are needed they will be located far from the urban centre where space rent is relatively cheap, but their shops where they meet the "trade" must be near the urban centre. When they are clustered, the buyers from outside the city know where to find them. The furrier market clusters tightly. Other markets need to be near the urban centre, but not so near, and these other markets cluster but in a loose fashion. Competitors in each market often find it convenient, for protecting and promoting their interests, to have a formal organization.

There are human as well as economic aspects in these specialized occupations of space in the urban community. The principal hotels, principal theatres, principal exclusive shops and principal social clubs are usually located within easy walking distance from one another at or near the urban centre; the logical meeting place both for strangers and for residents of the city; the most human and much alive part of the city. But there are many special areas in and near the midtown district and each is a human area in its own way, occupied mainly by one occupational group or another. The distribution is ecological when seen in terms of spatial use; it is equally economic and social. Some ecological students are prone to rule out all elements which tend to be social, cultural or sentimental.

Economic reasons may explain why banks, the stock market, insurance firms, and the export-import business tend to hover in a single area. But this area also has its rules of conduct, its social sanctions, its superstitions and traditions, even its atmosphere of human helpfulness. Economic reasons alone do not explain the presence of an old residential area near the heart of the city, inhabited by a few elite old families. All their old neighbours have moved, but they will not surrender.

Others hold that, although social determinants are indefinite and vague, they are real and may be as forceful as economic factors at times in deciding how certain areas of space in the community will be used. In some German cities may be found sections which, according to ecological theory, are perfectly located for industrial or residential development. In some cases long before industry arrived these were the woodland areas where people would go on a holiday. Because of that tradition they have become public woodland areas and are maintained in their natural state. Industrial and residential expansion had to move in other directions.

The uses of space are, to be sure, determined by land values and rents which are highest at the urban centre and tend to decline in the direction of outer community space. Each user of space, bank, hotel, department store, law office, distributor of heavy machinery, book publisher, garage, movie theatre, tends to locate where for his purpose the greatest economic advantage can be gained. Among other considerations are: need to be near the urban centre, ability to pay for the space, need to be near or among competitors, ability to make maximum use of small space. While each space occupier comes to his own conclusion, the considerations which condition the conclusion are not unique for him. Others for similar reasons reach the same conclusions; clustering in areas is the usual result.

Greer makes the point that, however much the distribution pattern of the city can be explained in ecological terms, there are many contradictions. Much that is included in the pattern does not seem logical. An old church may not be affected by land values at all, since it pays no taxes. In some cities are churches once surrounded by a residential neighbourhood. The neighbourhood has migrated, yet some of the families still return to their old church and it gains new members from the central area. Even people who do not belong to the church think of it as a landmark and any proposal to remove it would meet with resistance. An office building on that spot might be an economic asset, but for sentimental reasons the church remains. The same attitudes may be held by people toward an old cemetery near the urban centre.[4]

Ecology and Urban Sentimentality

Human ecology, more than any other sociological approach to understanding the urban community, precisely because it searches for logic in the uses of space, tends to expose innumerable examples that are far from logical. It helps to remind us that in the city where rationalism is presumed to dominate, there remains still a goodly measure of irrationality, which is accepted. An example of this was noted by Rosenmayr with respect to housing projects in Vienna. Some families living in slums had no wish to move to better housing in the suburbs. The old slum street was to them a neighbourhood and the idea of leaving it was not at all tempting, arguments against the slum were not convincing.[5]

Sometimes the economic influences which normally serve to distribute space users ecologically are interfered with by official action. Thus, a movement on the part of interested groups in a residential area may be successful in having a piece of land set aside for use as a public park. The existence of the park tends to increase the desirability of surrounding space for residential purposes. The municipal authority may then restrict the area for residential use only. This means that the price of land will not rise higher than the price paid for residence, although industry would be able and willing to pay a higher price. Thus, a residential area is protected against invasion. This does not prevent the residential land from going through a cycle of change. Single homes, as they grow old and outmoded, may be replaced by tall apartment buildings.[6]

Cities once surrounded by walls tend to retain the old street pattern after the walls have been removed. Sentimental attitudes toward preserving the old city develop, even to retaining the old narrow, winding streets. The "old city" in Frankfurt was totally destroyed by the bombing in World War II. When the rebuilding of the city began after the war a dispute began about the "old city." Many would have it rebuilt as it was formerly, even retaining the old architectural style. Others would have a new street pattern. As in other German bombed cities, the argument ended in a compromise between the "sentimental" and "practical" factions. Clearly, urban man is not behaving toward a physical environment alone. Land values are important, but social and psychological values are also there.[7]

Gist observed that in Bangalore there is not the tendency, as with American upper classes, for the rich to abandon residential areas in the city for the space and green of the suburbs.[8] This does not mean that the ecological factors, so evident in the space-use patterns of new countries do not exist on Old World cities. But there is in India, for example, this tendency to cling to old residential areas. Indian towns and even villages are divided, not primarily in economic terms, but on caste, occupation, kindred, ethnic or religious considerations. Often each ward is identified with certain definite cultural factors like caste, and sometimes sub-caste has its own system for regulating the social, religious and economic life of the area. The Brahmans, for instance, who form the apex of the social pyramid in the Hindu social order, occupy the principal locality and their houses are closer to the main temple and tank; whereas untouchables, the lowest in the social scale, are located in the outskirts of the town, frequently at a greater distance, symbolizing the social distance between the two groups. Movement from one area to another is made difficult, if not impossible, by the local caste organization, which permeates the entire life of the community. The social distance between the high caste and low caste people, between Parsees, Hindus, Muslims, Christians, etc. is maintained by denying residence to an outsider. In the various cultural zones of Indian cities such as Malabar Hills and Warli in Bombay; Burra Bazaar and Chowranghi in Calcutta; Basavana Gudi and Chamrajpet in Bangalore; Malmaddi and Haveripet in Dharwar, one could observe the social distance effectively reinforced by factors of caste, religion and other cultural traditions.

We must not suppose, however, that the ecological factors so evident in the space-use patterns of new countries do not exist in the cities of the Old World. Wherever change is introduced in repatterning the old Indian urban communities on the lines of new ideas of planning, the planners have experienced resentment of the people. And wherever people were left with the choice of making use of the new space, it was found that the old order was built on it reflecting the continuity of the old order of life to a greater extent. However, the social and psychological resistance to moving about, present everywhere to some degree, is far more in old historic cities. The presence of change becomes evident when compared in terms of generations instead of decades.

Ecology and Urban Residence

Apparently two kinds of determinants figure in the choices of urban space. One is impersonal and economic, while the other is expressive of social values. Of the two, the economic determinants are easier to study quantitatively. Understandably, a unit of urban land gets its value mainly from what it earns for the owner. But for some units of land sentimental values may enter, if only temporarily. Thus, urban man may behave ecologically with respect to land use for work purposes, but he may behave sentimentally in relation to land use for residential purposes. It may be loyalty for the neighbourhood, attachment to the old family home, or memories associated with the street and street corners; something makes him cling to a house although he could sell it at a high price and build a new house in a better locality.

Normally in the urban land market higher priority is given to work-related land uses; the uses that earn most. As a city grows, the centre overflowing outward, the direction of expansion will tend to be influenced by practical decisions; individual decisions more often than collective ones. In this competition for location, residential uses seldom have top priority, except for the wealthy or except as areas are reserved for residence only.

It is pertinent here to remind ourselves of an important difference between a residential and a work-related use of space. Residence is a consumer use of space, which means consumption in the private sphere. Space given to a park or playground also serves a consumer use, but in the public sphere. A work-related use of space (office or factory) is a use usually identified with production. Residence being a consumer use, it comes naturally to be associated in some respects with display. Thus, residential areas tend to be socially competitive. This display element relating to where one lives in what street and so on may help to stimulate high residential mobility, especially in American cities.

Whereas in the cities of India, as indicated above, various prohibitions and compulsions based on caste, kindred, religion, ethnic origin or other categories tend to prevent people from moving across lines from one residential area to another, such mobility is considerable in the United States. As Americans move upward in occupation and income they tend to move from houses of lower quality to houses of higher class, which usually means moving from an area of lower class to one of higher class. Thus, the upper class, to escape the oncoming middle class, move to new areas. The middle class moves to escape the oncoming lower class. Sometimes the people in a select area will endeavour to keep the lesser classes out by refusing to rent or sell houses to them. Such attempts are illegal and they usually fail. People in any social category tend to have such negative attitudes toward living near people considered by them to be in a lower social category. The difference we have in mind is this; the barriers against movement hold more firm in the Indian city, where areas also exist.[9]

Kuper, in his ecological study of Durban, South Africa, found that the four classes of people (Europeans, Africans, Indians and Coloreds which are mixed coloured) tend in part to segregate themselves, although a degree of social compulsion is also present. He identified several residential areas in the city and these he classified according to the social prestige of each. To illustrate how the people are distributed among these areas, we take, as seen in Table 6, three of these areas; one of low class at the periphery of the city, one of low class but of change or transition within the city, and Berea Ridge, an exclusive European area. Europeans comprise 32.7 per cent of the total population of Durban but they are 88.6 per cent of those living on the exclusive Berea Ridge. Indians comprise 36.3 per cent of the Durban population, but make up 57.6 per cent of those living in the inner area of poor residence, while the Africans are more on the periphery.[10]

TABLE 6 :

RACIAL DISTRIBUTION BY THREE SOCIOGRAPHIC ZONES

Racials groups	*Total-in all areas*	*On the periphery*	*Inner area, transitional*	*Berea Ridge*
Europeans	32.7%	12.5%	23.2%	88.6%
Coloreds	4.0	2.7	7.2	0.4
Indians	36.3	39.7	57.6	1.8
Africans	27.0	45.1	12.0	9.2
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%

While there may be social compulsions, racial, ethnic and other segregations in a great city tend also to be voluntary. People of like kind, because of language or other cultural reasons tend to draw together. But once drawn together, a group will tend to have segregations (economic or other) within its own ranks, and these usually mean ecological separations, a division of the space. Thus, within the Negro areas of New York and Chicago there are inner social-class areas, which tend to be economically determined.

Human Ecology and Slums

A slum is a residential area in which live the poorest people in the worst housing with the least of such public services as piped water, sewers, paved streets, fire protection and so on. Ecologically, the slum is a residential area the space of which is least in demand for other uses, although a slum may be an area in transition which is occupied by the poor until taken over for other uses. Sociologically, a slum may be an area of heterogeneous social types, all sorts of poor people mixed together. Such a slum is more likely to be found near the centre of the city. Other slums, elsewhere in the city or at the periphery may be homogeneous, different parts being occupied by people of particular racial, ethnic or other social types. The homogeneous slum, however poor, tends to develop neighbourhood characteristics.

In a growing city slums may be the habitat of large numbers of migrants seeking employment. In some developing countries many of these newcomers originated in rural places where housing and living conditions were not much better. Such a slum would probably be an area of high transiency, with a high ratio of males to females, and its inhabitants would cluster in groups according to villages of origin.

This crowding in of the rural poor has made for the growth of slums in the cities of India, more so in the industrial cities. Urbanward migration has been increasing since 1940 and it was further accelerated by the partition of the Indian subcontinent in 1947. The distribution of immigrants in cities like Hyderabad-Secunderabad and Jamshedpur varies from 52.8 per cent of the population to 82.3 per cent respectively. This flow of the rural poor increases and a good share of these take refuge in slum areas, because they cannot afford to live elsewhere. Burdened with kinship obligations, they do send a considerable portion of their earnings to their dependents who remain in the villages, either for their maintenance or to clear off the debts of their ancestors.[2]

Overcrowding in Indian cities is proverbial. In Gorakhpur 84 per cent of the residents and 77 per cent of the immigrants have less than 50 square feet of space per person. In Hubli 14 per cent of the total families with seven or more members live in single rooms. In Jamshedpur 35 per cent of the dwellings have more than one family living in each. Similarly in Lucknow as many as 62 per cent of the dwellings have more than four persons in each room. Such conditions also prevail in such cities as Bombay and Poona, and with such conditions in the cities of India the ecological patterns are often difficult to visualize.

The slum in a European city where immigrants are far less numerous tends to have much more stability in its life, and the areas are more clearly defined. But in these Western slums housing, amenities and levels of living in 1963 are far higher than in 1863. As concern about slums in the more advanced countries becomes less, the attention of social scientists turns more to the slums in the developing countries. This reflects the economic bonds growing between the advanced countries and the less developed ones.[11]

In general, slum areas in cities of advanced countries are tucked away in various tolerated areas between the central district and the periphery, including some industrial suburbs where the poor live near industrial plants. If the city is growing, with business and industry competing for space, also with increasing space demanded for public use, the shape and location of residential areas must also change. The well-to-do voluntarily move to select suburbs while the areas occupied by artisans and labourers tend to be crowded against with the result that even the slum dwellers find new areas more remote from the centre. This outward movement goes faster as rapid low-cost transportation is available. It is said that in some cities the rich live at the centre and the poor at the periphery, but these are cities without effective transportation to the outer areas.

Competition and Interdependence

Park, who may be regarded as the pioneer in the ecology of urban communities, recognized competition as the primary shaper in human as well as animal communities. In different ways, competition leads to divisions of labour and other arrangements for sharing the advantages of the habitat. Particularly in cities, competition leads to degrees of cooperation, which Park regarded as competitive-cooperation operating at two levels : (1) the biotic level in which people make common sense adaptations to one another on the basis of obvious mutual interest, which are not necessarily rationalized ; and (2) the cultural level at which man makes plans, agrees upon organizations, and promotes collective action.[12]

Competitive-cooperation comes about when competitors recognize that the extremes of contest can be damaging to all and they consciously come to agreement about limits and rules of conduct. If competitors are similar, all doing the same kind of work or selling the same things, their cooperation is *commensalistic,* called by some *commensalism.* Competition between unlike competitors relating to dissimilar functions is called *symbiotic,* hence *symbiosis,* which constitutes a special kind of division of labour. Each type of cooperation is a particular arrangement for resolving or averting conflict and both are present in the city.[13]

Whether the ecological adaptation is commensalism between like competitors (dress manufacturers) or symbiosis between unlike competitors (different shops and services), these adaptations lead to increasing interdependence between competitors, much as the division of labour, since it is a division of labour in which specialization and interdependence go hand in hand. The different medical specialists who must locate in a large city are very dependent upon one another. Their offices must be clustered in a limited area and there will be the drug stores and the stores handling the equipment needed by the medical profession. Firms making the machines used in the different industries must not be too remote from the industries, but the firms that repair these machines must be even nearer. In Detroit are many small industries that do not make automobiles; they specialize in making certain essential parts which they sell to the automobile industry. Specialization makes all this imperative. Competition and competitive resourcefulness are not at all smothered either by commensalism or symbiosis.

An area of industry may be expanding, but in whichever direction it expands the space there is already occupied. A higher price must be paid for the land, or a higher rental, which may displace existing occupants. This is sometimes called invasion, forcing the displaced occupant to find another location which is also occupied, another invasion. In a rapidly growing urban community a piece of land may be used by a series of occupiers, which is succession. A house may be occupied by a succession of residents over a period of years. In the meanwhile the house is getting old and more outmoded. With passing time it attracts occupants, not of higher but of lower social status, and the rent income of the building decreases. In time it is torn down and replaced by a more modern and more profitable building. In this example two kinds of succession are involved; a succession of occupants in the building and a succession of buildings on the land. A first class hotel in time becomes a second class hotel. As it gets older and more out of date it may become a third class hotel and perhaps an economic liability. Finally it is removed, but the land remains and its value is determined by accessibility to the urban centre.

The city also has its vices and parasitic elements. They too try to find space whereon to stand or wherein to hide, and they too must find a livelihood. However disapproved socially, they appear to find customers or clients in the symbiotic division of labour in the city. They fit into the ecological pattern as they can. Bopegamage points out such an area in Delhi :

> No one in the city finds it difficult to locate these areas. They are not far away. They are found in the heart of the city. They can be reached in eight or ten minutes ride from the industrial, commercial and administrative centres. There is a well-known road where engineering and building construction materials are sold during the daytime. When the business of the day is over and the shops are closed for the night, the "painted lady" and pimps take a stand on the pavements and the back lanes and start their business.[14]

The Urban Ecological Pattern

Practical people of all sorts concern themselves about a great variety of space-related problems in the urban community. The practical man in relation to his personal interests holds in mind a fairly clear image of the city. He knows the layout of his city ; housing, factories, transport systems and public facilities. Normally when he thinks of a social or other problem he visualizes it "on the ground," located at different points in the city. The practical man can understand the maps used by the ecologist because he has a map in the back of his head. On the ecological maps he can see the distribution of crime areas, areas of juvenile delinquency, areas of high tuberculosis rates, areas of substandard housing, the location of churches, schools, hospitals, playgrounds, and so on. In these terms ecological information is meaningful to ordinary people. Moreover, when a map is compared with a similar map for 1950, it is possible to see the changes that have taken place. Thus ecology can be educational.

The city planner is also a map maker and map user, but he normally does not make sociological studies, although he may utilize the ecological findings of the sociologist. The same holds for the public official.[15]

Certain human ecologists are interested in finding a theoretical basis for this type of research. They ask if there is a universal pattern for community organization and growth, some principle governing the distribution of space use. Burgess in 1925 offered the theory of concentric circles or zones, which postulates that many types of areas in the city tend to be logically distributed in a series of zones around the urban centre. In general, light industry, not needing so much space, was nearer the centre than heavy industry needing much space. Hotels and exclusive residential hotels were near the centre and so the areas of homeless and other single persons. Residential slums were in the first and second zones outside the centre. Homes of workingmen, mostly of the artisan class, were in the third zone and beyond the third zone came the suburbs. The pattern offered by Burgess did fit the Chicago situation and was not offered as a universal pattern. It was intended as a design to be tested in other places.[16]

According to the Burgess conception, the stimulus for growth and change moves mainly from the urban centre outward, mainly because it is in the centre where lines of contact and communication intersect. Actually, the central area functions like a front office for the whole metropolitan region. The Burgess theory was only offered as a beginning. Much more research needs to be done before we have what is needed; a body of ecological theory about space occupancy in the urban community and about urban growth. Definitely ecological research has been found to be useful because the data, like the problems, are related to people where they are "on the ground." Sociology in its study of the city includes much more than ecology, but it cannot afford to exclude ecology.

CHAPTER 5

GROUP BEHAVIOURS AND STRUCTURES

SOME of the thought expressed in the first two chapters will be repeated here, mainly because we will look closer at the groupings found in the urban community and their ways of behaving. Completeness cannot be attained in so few pages, any more than so small a volume can contain all that is pertinent to urban sociology. Much that will be said about urban groups and their behaviour may also apply to non-urban groups. Some rural-urban comparisons will be necessary, although our attention will be mainly on the urban community.

Primary and Secondary Groups

Nothing is more common in human society than the primary group, and no form of human association is more necessary for the individual or for society. The secondary group is relatively recent, and was never needed until societies began to assume more complex forms. It belongs essentially to urban life, an instrument of man's creation to facilitate mass living. It could not have evolved in the village because the village is essentially primary. However, in some advanced countries the secondary group is found in rural areas, one respect in which rural life is being urbanized. A farmer may join a marketing cooperative or a dairy cooperative; these are formal organizations often with branches in many villages.

The kinds of secondary groups are as numerous as the uses to which they are put. In some countries they are called voluntary associations. For those organized under law, the organizing members present themselves to a public authority and obtain a charter, in which the name of the organization and its precise purpose are written. Such secondary groups become incorporated bodies or legal persons, authorized to hold property, to sue or be sued, and to regulate their affairs. Each has its formal organization, elected officers, written rules, membership fees and each must keep written records. Although an impersonal, unfeeling "person," the organization is subject to the law as are its members individually.

Such a secondary group may organize for purposes of work and production (business, factory, bank); or to promote and protect the economic interests of its members (trade union, professional association, chamber of commerce); or to promote and protect a public interest (planning for the city, to conserve wild life, slum removal); or to promote and protect the interests of special groups which may be minorities (racial, ethnic, religious); or to promote an educational or cultural interest (schools, museums, music or other arts); but other groups may have political, patriotic, recreational or other purposes. They are designed to function in the mass society. The telephone book in London, for example, lists hundreds of such groups, and to classify these would result in a score of categories. For our discussion, such secondary groups may be seen as arrangements for getting things done. Indeed, without them the urban agglomerate could hardly function. We quote Wilensky:

> Thus we arrive at the following hypothesis: to be an effective source of social integration a primary group life must be wide ranging and must be meshed with a vital secondary group life. Something must mediate the relations between the individual immersed in his parochial concerns, on the one hand, and a powerful state and the great mass organizations of the city (corporation, labour union, political party and agencies of mass communication), on the other. Where the work place, the local union, the precinct organization foster stable, close friendships which function as transmission belts from leader to member, then an organization massive in size is not a *mass* in the sociological sense.[1]

Primary and secondary groups supplement each other. The secondary group is more than an instrument for promoting and protecting the mutual interests of members; it also serves the primary group (family, circle of friends, neighbourhood) by providing a milieu of contact in areas of common interest. Primary groups take form within secondary organizations. A worker does not know everyone in his trade union, his church, political party, etc. nor does he need to, but he does come to know some very well. In the village the primary group takes form through family contact or proximity of residence or in the play of youth. While this may happen in the city, friendships are more likely to be made on some basis of mutual interest.

The friendship circle, one's network of personal contact, may include persons widely scattered. Moreover, since job mobility and residential mobility are greater in the city, friendships tend to be transient. Besides moving from place to place (geographic, physical, or horizontal mobility), the urbanite may change to other work (professional or occupational mobility), and in the process he may change his social status (social or vertical mobility), which changes may be reflected in the composition of his primary group network, as implied in Chapter 2. Moving from place to place, one acquires new neighbours, but he may keep his old friends. If he moves intellectually or socially, he may gain or lose friends.

Nor does physical mobility greatly affect one's membership in secondary groups, but if his economic, social or cultural position changes, he may change from certain types of secondary organizations to others. If he changes from employed worker to become an employer, he may leave the trade union and join the employers' organization. But if a worker becomes a professor, he may continue for friendly or sentimental reasons to retain his trade union membership. If one gains wealth, he may change from a more liberal to a more conservative political party.

Functions of Secondary Groups

It is well known that not all urban people join secondary organizations, and not all of those who join, attend organization meetings. Many avoid the obligation that membership entails; paying membership dues, conforming to organization rules or giving time for organization activities. It is often possible to enjoy the benefits of an organization without joining. If one is a professional worker, physician, nurse, lawyer, professor, accountant, engineer, he may find membership advantageous Some organizations assume the right to force eligible persons to become members. A neighbourhood organization is usually one that rarely has full membership.

A political party may muster a majority of the votes, yet only a small per cent of those who vote with a party are members of it. This is one reason political parties have difficulty in gathering funds needed for their work, and this is one reason why political parties and other secondary organizations are often controlled by a small number of inner-group members.[2]

We mentioned that secondary organizations offer ways for interest groups to get things done. This is because they symbolize organized power. The power of the trade union is in the solidarity of its numerous members. When a union strikes, this work stoppage inconveniences the public and stops other work. If in any country the strike is illegal, the trade union is deprived of its principal weapon.[3] Unions must gain their ends through persuasion or political action, their power being in the number of votes they can control. Employer groups, lacking the power of numbers, may use their economic power to get things done. Their power lies in their liquid wealth and properties, with which they influence politics. Getting things done for the trade union usually means getting higher wages, shorter hours or better working conditions. For the organization of employers to get things done may mean to effectively resist the trade unions and yet to increase production. In such efforts by one side or the other, the public as represented by still other organized groups becomes involved, and their interests must be safeguarded by government.

Some organized groups have neither the power of numbers or of wealth, but they may have access to the opinion-forming media of the community. All groups have access to these media, although some are more skilled in opinion formation, in particular the smaller organized groups whose members may be of a higher educational and perhaps social level, white-collar and professional workers, for example. Among the "weaker" organizations will be those with welfare or service objectives whose members are not so concerned about personal gain, rather they look to the public interest in matters of education, health, culture, morals, the arts and so on.

Secondary organizations are contractual, committed to serving their members in specific interest areas. Relations between organization and members are impersonal as in a business. Officers are elected and committees are named; all working according to written rules and all performance becomes a matter of record. The organization can, within the rules, impose obligations on the members and the members can make demands on the organization. We spoke of the organization as being incorporated under law, which is not necessary for some types of organizations, although even for these the formal order of operation and the contractual assumption prevails. In either case, the organization tends to have a continuing life, although members may come and go. The organization with its records and properties, its body of rules and traditions may continue for generations. To accomplish its purposes, the formal organization must have a measure of authority within itself, which is delegated to committees or to members assigned to organization tasks. Within its limited sphere of activity the organization is somewhat like a private government. However, it operates in accordance with civil law and civil government; in fact when operating effectively within its special area, it supplements civil government. Indeed, in order to get things done in the community, the democratic municipal authority solicits the cooperation of such private organizations.

Family as a Primary Authority System

For exchanging confidences as for exchanging favours or for occasional material help, the primary group has a practical utility for its members. This relationship calls for both giving and receiving. In many respects it is severely compulsive, making the little tight-knit group a small authority system. Traditionally the family has been such a primary group, one to which the individual in the village may be more loyal than to the village itself. Such loyalty is accepted and expected. In the family there is order and control, usually based on seniority in the male line; the oldest male is both most respected and most strictly obeyed. Traditionally, small communities have relied upon this system of authority within the family. As Dore observed, the Japanese like to speak of their 'family system" as well they may, since in few countries has the idea of family been more sustained by other forms of authority in the larger society. Family authority was utilized by government.

> Before 1945 they heard politicians, school masters, the local mayor, the local battalion commander and the countless publicists of the press and radio stress the importance of the

> "family system in our country" as the embodiment of all that was fine and noble in the national tradition, the only suitable training ground for patriotic and loyal citizens, the secret of all the moral fibre of the Japanese people, the core (foundation, pillar, bulwark) of the national policy. Since the war we have heard somewhat less assured voices denounce the "Japanese family system," .. as a hindrance to democracy, the last and strongest rampart of feudalism, symbol of a morality which ignores human rights, inhibits individual enterprise and responsibility, enforces the eternal subjugation of women, and fosters the attitudes which facilitate the organization of a totalitarian state.[4]

While the family ideal may have been systematically exploited by political and industrial leaders in Japan, it is also strongly supported in other regions, especially in the least industrial countries. The joint family in India, for example, is traditionally a primary group authority system and as such it has served well. It tends to survive even in the cities. Agarwala reports that the Marwadi Community, living in various Indian cities for centuries, has maintained the traditional joint family system and he calls it "an outstanding example of the continuance of the joint family and caste system in spite of industrialization, technocracy and Western education and, in some respects, rather because of them."[5]

Writing about the kinship organization in India, Karve claims that the rural migrant to the city maintains his inherent faith in the joint family, and its functioning.

> Instead of founding independent families in the towns where they are employed, they tend to keep their ties with their family at home. They send money to the improvished farmers at home, send their wives home for child-birth and go home themselves for an occasional holiday or in times of need. The urge to visit the family for certain festivities and at sowing and harvesting times is so great that there is a seasonal migration of mill labourers in all industrial towns. Even if a man earns good wages it is difficult for him to find a bride from decent house if he has no family with some land in the village.[6]

In Japan there was an effort on the part of civic and political leaders to utilize the joint family in the evolving urban milieu. Many small industries were formed as family concerns, the village system of family structure and authority being transferred to the factory. This type of industrial organization survives with difficulty against the advance of modern types of industry with their more rational methods of management. There is a tendency for the young as they are able to become professionally and economically independent to detach themselves from family authority, or to honour it with lip service only. As daughters acquire education and enter the labour market they demand the right to select their own marriage partners and when married they are less willing to submit to the authority of the mother-in-law.

Perhaps nowhere is the authority of the family system more elementally rooted than in the tribal communities of some African countries where industrialism and urbanism are newcomers. There is lacking the advanced ruralism of countries like India and Japan. The people migrate from a subsistence agriculture to the chaotic agglomerates of the embryo cities, a leap from the tribal village to an unguided and still undefined urbanism. Migrants are still presumed to be, and generally they recognize themselves as being under the authority of family heads and tribal chiefs in the village. The joint family concept migrates with the migrant. Comhaire found that even middle-class African families in Leopoldville make an effort to retain the joint family tradition.[7] Apparently the efforts of the village to control family members who have migrated becomes at times petty and exacting, largely due to the villager's inability to understand the migrant's situation. If the migrant son in the city marries the migrant daughter of another family in the same or some other village, there is likely to be a great dispute about the marriage payment from the bridegroom and his family.[8]

Understandably the bridegroom, with little money to spare, may try to evade the marriage payment. It has less meaning in the city. But should his wife visit her parents in the village she would not be allowed to return. His marriage in the city under civil law comes into conflict with tribal law. The authority of the family may hold in other respects but on this point it may have to yield.

Family and Change-Inducing Factors

For the joint family in Congo to yield on such an issue as the bride price must be seen as an adaptation rather than a retreat. Learning to live in the urban situation may call for many adaptations, but these may not, perhaps for generations, affect the joint family as an authority system. Prediction in this area is hazardous. Even in the rapidly changing Western cities the joint family continues, although mainly in the upper classes.[9]

The African villager living in the city is caught between two culture systems; family is rooted in one, while his job and future are rooted in the other. The first is personal and ascriptive, the second impersonal and rational. The first is traditional in orientation, while the second is oriented to the non-traditional thinking of science, and a rational ordering of work and other affairs. The first has its origin in agrarian ruralism, the second in the industrial urban situation. The first is family-centred and operates within the realm of the primary group, while the second is largely detached from familism, since its field of operations lies within the realm of formal secondary groups.[10]

It is to be expected that the family will be affected in different ways in the impersonal milieu of industrial urbanism, which in many respects is blind to traditional social distinctions. It accepts women to be educated as well as men, and increasingly women are accepted in the labour market. It means that a woman, professionally trained, can be economically independent. This raises serious problems about the two conflicting roles of women, especially in Western society.[11]

Many are of the opinion that the trend in Western cities toward the nuclear family of parents and children living separately from grandparents, uncles, aunts and cousins, is likely to develop slowly, if at all, in Eastern cities. Others say the trend is already under way in the Eastern cities, but even they find it is not a trend with high momentum.[12] What is needed is abundant research observation as to the rate of change in different types of urban communities compared with rural communities. It would be necessary also to observe whether family change is taking place faster with some social classes than with others.

Among some students of the family in Western countries, and among other observers as well, there is pessimism about the future of the family, but such views have been voiced for more than a century. All recognize that change is under way, but there is some fear that the family is breaking to pieces and will disappear. They see the family losing its functions, being threatened by rising divorce rates, many couples do not have children, etc. Most family sociologists do not agree. They answer that the nuclear family is stronger than ever because it is being held by inner bonds and not by the old institutional pressures from without. They say it is adapting to urban life, and it is still the dominant primary group, most other primary groups being accessory to it[13]

The results of Ishwaran's research into the Dutch middle-class urban family of today, as found in the *Randstad* area, that part of the Netherlands where the largest cities are located, indicate that the nuclear or elementary family has effectively maintained its essential characteristics. The reproductive function of the family is considered sacred, divorce is frowned down, and the socialization of children is seen as the basic duty of parents. The role of kinsmen outside the domestic unit is equally important in maintaining the sacred boundaries of the family, thus denoting the influence of the members of the extended family upon the elementary family.[14]

Social Class and Stratification

People can be divided into all sorts of groups by the statistician and each group may be called a class. Lundberg adds that people have a way of dividing themselves into groups and in this process they develop *satus attitudes* toward others as well as themselves. The result is not a statistical or *logical class* but a *social class*. On the basis of status attitudes different classes appear, higher or lower in relation to one another. Seen in orderly array, these constitute a *social stratification,* or class system.[15] Such a class system is found in every society, but if it is a very old social stratification it may be known as a *caste system.*

Whether class or caste, one decisive conditioning element in such a system is occupation, the kinds of work performed. Attitudes toward work as heavy or light, dirty or clean, dangerous or safe, are apparently universal. On the basis of power, which is unequally distributed, the work gets distributed in like unequal terms. Persons of high status monopolize the desirable occupations and the least desirable are assigned to persons of lowest status. In the urban community today occupation is only one factor in class identification. Since work and occupation are separated from home and family for most people, consumption (spending money) and social activity figure in defining the social class of a person.

Ill-considered complaints are often heard, with proposals to abolish social class, which usually means to abolish certain upper classes. In cases where that has been done other upper classes appeared, although called by another name. All the levels of an essential social stratification again appeared, all claiming to be of "the working class." Such a country, striving to become industrial, could not operate its industrial system without the various occupational levels and special types of work, with a corresponding wage and salary structure. The age-old social processes by which classes are defined and redefined, a never-ending preoccupation of people, is not abolished by changing the political system. It continues in neighbourhoods, work places, professional circles, at conferences and even in ranks of public authority. Thus in any society, whether people are aware of it or not, the class or rating process goes on. People think of others as higher or lower than themselves. One puts this neighbour in one category and that neighbour in another, and he knows to which category or class he belongs.[16] Those who have made studies of class find that lower-level people tend to rate themselves above their class, while upper-level people rate themselves lower than their class; toward the "Golden Mean."

One's social class is more than his occupation or income; it is also a way of thinking and behaving. At times in European History membership in the upper class was akin to a profession; the "gentleman" was a role.[17] Even today one's class may determine the clubs and associations in which he will hold membership, and he will cooperate in keeping lesser people out of these groups. This attitude of exclusiveness may also be shown by the middle class toward the lower class or by one lower-class group toward another.

Through class the individual is identified with social roles as well as occupations. Says Gould, "The main difference between industrial and non-industrial civilization is the way in which roles and role occupants are regarded as separate in the former and as identical in the latter."[18] Thus in the non-industrial society, if one knows the class or caste of the individual, the occupation is also known and if he knows the occupation of the individual, the class is also known. In an industrial civilization the members of a class may be of different occupations. Of a family in the skilled labour or artisan class, the father may be a carpenter, the son a metal worker and the daughter a secretary, but they eat at the same table.

Social Structure and Community Morale

As an aggregate of people, the community in its organized terms is a constellation of formal and informal groupings; that is secondary and primary groups. All are included in primary groups; indeed it would be difficult for an individual not to be. All do not identify themselves with secondary groups; some are not *community actors* who join and participate in affairs. Some, identified as *isolates*, may join but they participate very little. Another group, called *deviates*, may or may not join, but they tend not to be cooperative. The community actor is positive, the isolate is neutral, but the deviate is critical in his thinking and negative in his conduct. Some may regard his behaviour as misconduct, or criminal, in extreme cases. All the types function within the frame and influence of the secondary organizations, as they also share the community life. There are, to be sure, other ways of participating in community life besides joining secondary groups. One contributes if he does no more than earn his living and conduct himself in an orderly manner.

As a social class structure, the community includes all levels of the population and their work. The class structure interrelates with the group structure, in fact social class is reflected, particularly in the social groups. Some groups may cut across classes, as when persons of different classes join the same political party, and a religious organization tends also to include higher and lower classes. The classes are not likely to be mixed in a social club and not always in leisure activities. Since the educational level of a higher class, as well as the level of occupation, exceeds that of a lower class, so the income of the higher class would be more. The highly specialized types of work; technical, scientific, educational and administrative, would tend to be a monopoly of the upper classes; much as common labour belongs to the lower class and skilled work to the middle class.

In a socially competitive society wherein class lines can be crossed by some born in a lower class, although the upper classes may try different devices to keep the "climbers" out. Families identified with one class may strive to enter a higher one, as when they try to join the social clubs of the next higher class, spend their vacations at the same holiday resorts, or send their children to the same private schools. First, they must acquire the symbols of the next higher class; type of house, of automobile, house furnishings, all of which can be had with money. But more than money is needed for attaining the more subtle symbols of class; cultural interests, manners and graces, conversation content, etc. What is especially important to be accepted by the next higher class is family background. Two generations may be needed before the climbing family is accepted.

Even a changing social class system serves to instill a semblance of order in a society, not a mandated order but one that emerges from social interaction. People tend to put one another in their places, while being themselves kept to some extent in place. If the class stratification is a class system then the social order will tend toward rigidity. But even the rigid caste system may be on the defensive much more in the urban than in the rural community.

It is pertinent to note that in India caste organizations are taking form to promote the welfare of caste members and to vigorously defend them against the insecurities of secular forces. What is more pertinent in this regard is that these caste organizations are formally organized and are found mainly in cities which have provided them with a fertile ground for action and growth.

Solidarity and Community

Durkheim thought of pre-urban communities as having a solidarity based on the similarity of the people and the sameness of their interests. Each man's role is evident and understandable to every other. Each knows what is expected of him and every other in the relatively simple division of labour. The pattern of roles fits together and no one is left out. In such a community Durkheim recognized a solidarity which he identified as *mechanical*, but such a solidarity could be disrupted easily by change. When he looked at the urban community he also found cohesive elements and also a solidarity which was not of the mechanical type. Durkheim identified this as *organic* solidarity. The urban division of labour is more complex, more subject to change and the course of change is less predictable. Despite change, the urban community retains equilibrium, as if urban man had some innate capacity for adapting, a facility to consciously reorient himself in the face of change.[19]

What Durkheim saw in the urban community is a kind of social wholeness that is not thrown out of balance by economic, technical or social change going on within. The social structure with its ever-evolving networks of groups does not fall into confusion, nor do changes in the class system prove disorganizing. The ongoing and interrelated processes, which form and re-form in the midst of change, carry on with essential flexibility. The entire organization appears to be vitalized rather than weakened by change; and this despite the fears about chaos in the urban agglomerate. Much of the stimulus for this change is internally generated, particularly in relation to work and occupation. Change in the work sphere inevitably brings change in social structure and behaviour, but the wholeness does not break down. It is seen in primary groups; they change but do not vanish. Secondary groups change, but the capacity to reorganize them continues. Social class structures are forced to adapt, but social class gets redefined and goes on.

In the idea of organic solidarity is the implication of ongoing, unfolding social structure in which man is not only being pushed about; he also pushes as he participates in bringing about change. Boskoff writes, "Essentially, organic solidarity refers to a complex, subtle type of social organization marked by extensive division of labour and sociocultural specialization, and a set of indirect 'but effective forms of interdependence."[20]

This interdependence of urban life can be seen in a great variety of social, economic and technical networks. Although well adjusted urban people may not be aware of these interdependency networks to the effectiveness of which they contribute, they are not confused about the various processes in which they effectively participate. The types of interdependence are the sum total of all such effective participations. Thus the city is able to feed itself, keep itself warm, provide itself with shelter and still enjoy a measure of leisure time. In many regions millions of people living in limited areas are able to move about without friction and to work without frustration. This is apparently what Durkheim meant by organic solidarity.

More on Getting Things Done

The idea of organic solidarity gets further meaning in relation to primary groups, which tend to function mainly in relation to the individual's non-work interests. For example, the individual's circle of kin and friends, his contact network, tends to be a resource. He leans on his contacts, as they on him, and he tends to cling to them as they are useful to him. One may lose some of his friends if he is no longer a resource for them. In this respect the family bond is more to be relied on, but in the urban community if a family member becomes a liability the family bond may weaken. Most individuals, however, are not liabilities most of the time ; they retain their primary contacts and through these are continuously being integrated in the wider community These primary group phenomena are not of the village type but they provide the colour and zest essential to urban living.

Contacts with secondary groups are little concerned with the personal and personality elements which are the life of primary group networks. Membership in a trade union assumes friendship but does not demand it, nor do the formal groups of the business men and industrialists. These formal secondary groups have no other purpose except to serve. The primary groups lend spirit to the life of the urban mass society, but the secondary groups get things done.

There are some in-between groups that are formal in organization, but informal in their function; International Rotary being one of these. One joins Rotary for practical reasons, to be among leaders in business, industry, welfare and the professions, and the organization does get things done, but Rotary is also committed to formal socialization. Like other formal organizations that emphasize service as a by-activity, Rotary concerns itself with the educational, cultural and welfare interests of the community. There are also the special organizations in these areas of community interest, doing collectively what individuals alone could not · promoting those works and services calculated to make the community a better place in which to live, work and enjoy leisure.[21]

Finally, something must be said about what may be the most obvious point of all; citizen participation in the work and life of the urban community. Much work is needed to keep a city orderly, clean, healthy and pleasing to walk in and to view. Much more than the naked work is needed to get such things done. There must be a general interest on the part of the citizenry. The people of the community must be informed about what is being done, what needs to be done and what can still be done. They need to have a general idea about how things can be done and by whom. The citizenry must then express their interest through their different organizations. That is the ideal, one that is much advocated, and many citizens work hard to stir that kind of community participation. They are the community actors to which reference was made above. They are a minority. Apparently the majority of urbanites belong to the other two groups the neutral isolates and negative deviates.

Many students of urban life are concerned about the lack of community interest on the part of a goodly section of the urban population. They speak of lassitude, of passivity or of *anomie*, a proclivity of people to live in the city without being aware of or interested in the community.[22] Some are of the opinion that the active citizens by variously using persuasion and influence can draw more and more of their fellow townsmen into participation. In American cities this has been done to the point of exhaustion with very little success.

Perhaps we need to examine further this notion, looking at some of the best managed cities as well as some of the worst. We might even find that citizen participation in well managed cities is no higher than in the worst. Yet in a crisis people will rise en masse to do whatever is needed. Perhaps we should look behind the answer of a municipal official in a city of the Netherlands, a well-managed city. When he was asked about citizen participation he answered that the municipal officials in his city would be offended if waited on and pressured by groups of citizens. They would feel they were no longer trusted. In his city the officials have more than two centuries of proud record. But they utilize the citizens. For almost every office in the city government there is a committee of officials and leading citizens, the leaders of the secondary groups in the city; labour, business, industry, religion, welfare, recreation, veterans and others. Citizen participation comes at election time. Between elections the contacts between the municipal government and the community are through the leaders of the major formal groups. In the meantime the ordinary citizen "participates" by going about his ordinary affairs, working, living his home life, being a neighbour, paying his taxes and obeying the laws.

This seeming indifference of many citizens for the affairs of their community is not merely a matter of our time. We have no evidence that there is more of this attitude than in the 1890's when Durkheim wrote about it. Apparently today as then the conscience of the urban community is expressed by a limited fraction of the citizens, including the different elites. In saying this we do not query the importance of wider citizen participation and finding ways of doing this is a worthy subject for further study.

CHAPTER 6

WORK AND LEISURE UNDER URBANISM

In this chapter we will consider those behaviours in community life relating to the use of time in work activity, non-work activity and leisure. For man in the industrial urban community, non-work activities are those which in some respects assume the character of work, although not work in the sense that they are the source of one's livelihood. Non-work may also have the character of leisure. Work is seen as productive activity for gain, while non-work includes a variety of tasks performed by the individual for himself, family, friends, neighbours or organizations. They are sometimes called obligations which the individual may or may not enjoy doing.

Leisure is usually regarded as the time given to enjoyable or recreational activity. By common usage, all time not given at work for pay or work-connected travel, whether used for recreation or not, is called leisure. According to this common usage, a man who works for others as most employed urbanites do has two kinds of time: that which he sells, which is called work, and that which is called his own time, or leisure. Some call it free time. As people today use the term, leisure has two meanings : (1) time used for diversion or recreation, and (2) all free time not used for work. In this connection we do not include time used for eating, sleeping and body care, only the remaining twelve to fourteen hours of the day.

To avoid this confusion, and for the purposes of this chapter, we will consider leisure as the opposite to work. Leisure time used for pleasure we will call "leisure for amusement," "leisure for recreation," "recreational leisure," or by some similar identification. Other free time we will call "non-work," mainly because we know of no other term for it. In some connections leisure for recreation and non-work, when we have all free time in mind (except time for eating, sleeping and body care) will be spoken of as leisure. We begin with a look at work.

Class and Occupation

As we noted in the previous chapter, a social class system is largely the product of the work people do, or the work done by their ancestors, although in the highly industrial society leisure may also figure in defining social class. The social class of sons, if inherited, particularly in Western countries, is associated with wealth or position achieved initially by the work of the fathers. Sons may acquire with other inherited properties, their occupations, although in Western countries this would be true mainly of upper-level occupations. In traditional societies the son of a poor man may inherit little more than a property right to a type of work. In this way through centuries, at least oldest sons have inherited occupations. Often in the public service sons have inherited offices which were initially purchased by fathers or grandfathers.

The inheritance of an occupation as an aspect of social class, viewed from the property standpoint, was a right. If viewed from the standpoint of social order and control, it was an obligation for both fathers and sons, since it served to maintain order in a relatively static society. It insured the continuation of the economic base of the family and it helped to keep families within their class. It served well the needs of family and community in pre-industrial society.

With the growth of industrialism a new class-occupation relationship is developing. One can notice such a trend in a developing city like Hubli-Dharwar in the south of India, and here urbanization according to Western standards is at a low ebb. In most Indian cities where the traditional handwork occupations continue (carpenter, smithy, leatherworker, sweeper), people remain bound together in the old relationships. These occupations are not yet threatened by machines and new work techniques. The movement of people from these lower levels to higher occupations, usually identified with upper castes has made its beginnings only in recent years.

Although industrialism may change the ways of work, even substituting machines for tools, the class system is not thrown out of balance ; the new occupations that emerge and the old ones that may have been changed, tend to be associated with class. What is changed is the extent to which occupations are inherited. Those occupations that are likely to be inherited under industrialism are the ones which may be associated with power of wealth. A physician or a lawyer with a lucrative practice has something of worth to pass on to his son, so the manager who may have an investment in the enterprise he manages.[1]

The old and the new class-occupation relationships represent two different systems of work and social organization : pre-industrial and industrial. The age-old first system with its fixed relationships may be thought of as family-centered and ascriptive. The emerging other system with its somewhat loose class-occupation relationships may be thought of as individual-centered. The two systems stand in sharp contrast when they meet in the industrial urban community. When the two systems met initially during the early phase of the Industrial Revolution in Europe they clashed. The result is well known ; the factory began making the shoes, the cloth and things of metal. In the European and other Western countries the rationalized new system has become accepted with the well-known occupational and social changes.

In general, the family-centered work relationship is dominant in developing countries, while the individual-centered relationship spreads from the more urban and industrial countries. Indeed, it is being established with purposeful vigour in the communist countries. However, even in developing countries we find degrees of individual centrism, on the one hand, and degrees of family centrism on the other. Individual centrism in the labour market, as well as rationalism in work tend to advance with the spread of industrialism, naturally, with resistance from family centrism although not organized resistance except in isolated cases.

Dimensions of Industrial Work

As the term is normally used, Industrial work includes all types other than work associated with agriculture. Industrial workers are employed in trade, manufacture, transport and service, including self-employed workers and the clerical occupations ; mostly persons who sell their labour for wages or salaries. The organization in which the great majority are employed range from ten to a thousand or more workers. Normally an employer (individual or corporate) assumes responsibility for the work, pays labour and other costs and disposes of the product While the individual owner may be absent in communist countries, other features of organization and operation will be present[3] Whether profit is the motivating force as under capitalism, or general welfare as under communism, organization and work norms are similar

Under the industrial system the relation between worker and employer is contractual The first delivers labour during stipulated hours at the market rate of pay for a particular kind of work On his part of this contract, the employer pays for this time and talent and assumes responsibility for its efficient use While the relationship may also be one of friendship, that is not assumed as part of the contract, which is often quite impersonal The larger the work place, the more impersonal the worker-employer relationship tends to be[4] while the larger the work place becomes the more necessary it is for an operation to be impersonal Without understanding this necessity, critics of rationalized work often describe the industrial work place as hard and cold

The employer resorts to whatever means he can devise to increase output per worker and output per machine Originally in Western countries he utilized from 72 to 84 hours of the worker's time per week exacting work to the point of fatigue Methods of speeding the work have also been used, but these proved unsatisfactory and wasteful Then employers turned to improving the machines and this effort continues, making machines more and more productive Machines can now perform types of work difficult for man, also performing rapidly with greater uniformity and precision than is possible by hand work

We need not dwell upon how workers were exploited in the evolution of industry, that record is known Ordinary workers have always been exploited, but never less so than under industry today Fortunately in Western countries the revolution in industry was preceded and paralleled by the political revolution In England, as workers gained political rights they managed to gain rights in the labour market According to the Combination Act of 1799, it was against the law even for workers to hold meetings to discuss a labour organization While this act was repealed in 1824, the legal right to form a trade union did not come until 1871. Then came rising wage scales, shortening the work week and improving conditions of labour, as well as legislation for security and welfare.[5]

Most of the evolution in the work ways of Western industry has taken place since the emergence of trade unions, much of it since 1900. Industry as never before was forced into a position of forced resourcefulness. The factory had to produce and sell more to meet higher labour and other costs. This pressure on industry to be more productive continues. It must ever strive for more efficient ways of organizing and performing work, while with each advance in efficiency came new demands for higher wages and fewer hours of work. Improvements include:

1. *Increasing worker productivity.* This has been done mainly by raising the skill level of workers or by eliminating handwork and unskilled labour. Little can be achieved by speeding the workers.
2. *Improvement of machines.* This means designing new and more effective machines. It also means arranging machines in such a way that the work flows easily from one to another. This leads to complexes of machines under the direction of other machines, automation.
3. *Organization of the work process.* This means essentially a co-ordination of workers and machines in such a way that there is a minimum of lost motion and time in the use of both workers and machines. The production process becomes more and more integrated, as a single mechanism.
4. *Engineering and management.* These professions, little used by industry before 1900, are not recognized as the "brain," the "control." Management, which includes engineering as its technical arm, is the head of work organization. It makes increasing use of technical research, psychological and sociological research, market research, finding ways to increase the efficiency of the work process.

Occupations and Skills

Many handicrafts were eliminated or greatly modified by the factory system. In many countries the shoemaker lost his work to the maker of boots and shoes by factory methods, but he continues to be much in demand for the repair of shoes. The furniture maker is still present, although his work is more mechanized. In many countries the blacksmith has about disappeared, but most of his skills have carried over to a new occupation; he is the garage mechanic. The tailor is still here and he still makes some clothing, but his role is now more of a service.

On the other hand, industrialism has created new occupations and professions that could hardly have been imagined in earlier times. This is to be increased with the new forms of energy, new technics and the advances in science. The typewriter opened the way for women to office employment where now there are many other kinds of machines. The camera started a whole new industry (cinema, television) affecting both work and leisure, and atomic energy staggers the imagination.[6]

Many occupations in the industrial community are not occupations at all; they are functions in a collective work process, and they change with changes in the process. The book of occupations in any industrial country will contain descriptions of several thousand such occupations, some peculiar to one industry, some to another. Some are generally known, others are known only to a particular industrial group. Such a book must be in process of continuous revision, because these occupations change with each new machine, each new product made, even with each new type of material used. For these reasons it is sometimes said that most modern workers do not have occupations. They do have skills of a general kind and work knowledge. They have a higher level of education than their fathers needed. Their skill is that they may be used for many kinds of work in a particular industrial field.

We quote Hughes who sees an occupation not as a set of activities associated with making or doing a particular thing, it is rather the function of an individual in the production process, a place that he fills in a work organization, an "ongoing system of activities." There are many kinds of work systems from small shops to big factories, but the work is group activity. "The ties between the persons in different positions may be close or so distant as not to be social; they may be formal or informal, frequent or rare. The essential thing is that the occupation is the place ordinarily filled by one person in an organization or complex of efforts and activities."[7] If one moves to another spot in the work organization doing another kind of work, what he takes along is general knowledge and skill. He acquires in the new occupation a particular use pattern of his skills. If he needs special training, it can be given often in a few hours. The large industry has qualified persons specialized in giving such "job training."

The engineers and managers who design the work process are careful not to overload any occupation with skill demands. It may contain two-three or four related operations, what the ordinary worker can learn in a few hours. In these terms occupation differs from the craft of the artisan, who must know the many ways of working with his material and his tools. The carpenter needs a particular skill for each tool, also a general skill involving tools, materials and tasks in different combinations. His jobs are rarely repetitive, and he works with a minimum of supervision. When he names his occupation, people know what his work is about. But the worker in a factory or office may have to explain what he does. He is likely to be identified with one social class or another on the basis of his income and spending.

Industrial success literature, especially in the United States, formerly contained many stories of men who had "worked their way up" from a low position to the top one. But working "from the ground up" and learning all the types of work along the way is hardly possible in a modern enterprise, which has a three-level system:

1. *Handwork.* Includes unskilled, semi-skilled operatives, some types of skilled workers, normally calls for elementary education of about eight years, the least educated being unskilled, receive payment in wages.
2. *White-collar, clerical.* Includes some skilled handworkers who may be foremen, work relates to record-keeping, computation and other paper-handling, normally calls for high school or a total of 12 years of schooling, payment normally in salaries by week or month.
3. *Management, supervisory, technical.* Includes the workers who plan, decide and direct, normally calls for some or

considerable university education, receives salary payment.

One does not move, normally, from a lower to a higher level at the plant unless, in the case of the handworker, he is attending school while at work and acquiring the needed education. The three-level division, although it may have social implications, is not of social origin, but rises out of the nature of modern industrial work. Whereas the old handicraft system utilized apprenticeship as the method of learning an occupation, learning little on the school; the industrial system increasingly uses the school, having no need for apprenticeship. However, certain hand crafts (carpenter, painter, machinist, electrician, printer, etc.) still utilize apprenticeship to some degree.

Fear of Automation

Critics of industrialism charge that it destroys craftsmanship and that it depersonalizes work; that it separates work from home and now separates work from all leisure interests that once mixed with work. Such complaints have been and still are expressive of fear. Now comes the greatest fear of all, that automation, which means the extreme mechanization of industry, will disemploy half the labour force; that we move in the direction of automatic, workerless factories. To this fear, which concerns the advanced rather than developing countries, we will give a closer look.

Automation is merely a new name for an industrial trend which has been under way for years; the making of more efficient machines, the combining of two or more machines into one, and now the making of machines to move the work from one machine to the other. Instead of one worker attending one machine or (as it latter happened) one worker attending several automatic machines, now a machine will do the attending and the whole line of machines will be electronically operated from a control room. In other words, the whole factory becomes a single mechanism and, according to this fear, only a few technicians will be needed, the rest of the workers will be jobless.

First, as Naville, the French student of labour, reminds us, we know too little about automation to predict its consequences.[8] There is no automatic factory yet, only a few automatic processes in certain major industries. But there is a tendency among workers to identify any improvement of machinery as automation. Such improvements have been taking place for a century, and they represent moves in the direction of automation. The workerless factory is far in the future. Most of these mechanical changes do increase production and "save labour," but the number of workers in the industries tends to increase.

Second, as in the past and as a natural consequence of increasing complexity, increasing mechanization may eliminate some jobs but it creates others. It disposes of some skills but calls for other skills, usually in greater variety. Automation would demand more technicians and skilled workers to "supervise," repair and keep mechanisms in order. Since production would increase, more white-collar work would be called for, more workers to prepare materials for the factory process, and more workers to store, ship and sell the finished product.[9]

Third, a trend already under way, automation would tend to eliminate unskilled labour and it would call for more school training for workers at all three levels mentioned above. More workers will need more technical training. Some persons assume that women would be eliminated from the labour market, it being their view that women are incapable of receiving technical education. Others declare that persons over fifty years will be eliminated. Actually, the more years needed for one to get his education for work, 12, 16, 20, the longer he remains in active work, both industry and the community have a larger investment in him. There is apparently no scientific basis for the fear that women cannot be trained for technical work.

Fourth, there is the complaint that automation will give man more leisure than he is prepared to use. In Western countries this fear has been expressed with each advance in technology which tended to free man from hard labour. Some moralists believe man needs work to protect himself against the temptations that come with increasing leisure. Some intellectuals believe that too much leisure among the lower classes will lower the cultural level of the higher classes.

People in developing countries would have little concern about automation; they wish first to have their countries industrialized. However, any step in the direction of industrialism is also a step in the direction of automation. If these countries produce goods for the world markets, they must compete with the most efficient industrial plants in other countries. If they are less efficient in their work their production costs will be higher.

Time and Man's Work

Salz made a study of Ecuadorean Indians to determine what changes would be needed to transfer these people from a primitive kind of agriculture to industrial work. One point was clear; the Indian's rhythm is casual. He lacks the strict time discipline necessary for industrial work. He can work fast if he must, but he is rarely confronted with the need for hurry. Time for him is not an economic item to be measured against money values.[10] This observation would apply to rural people of similar cultural level in other lands. They have a time discipline, their work and life tempo, and it serves their purposes, but it would not serve for industry.

It is said that rural people have a natural time orientation, that urban people have a mechanical time orientation, a clock-regulated time order. Clocks were invented and perfected in cities because they were needed there for purposes of trade and commerce, as they were later needed by industry. The clock became the mechanism for co-ordinating other mechanisms. It was needed when workers began selling their time in hourly units, but it was also needed to measure the pace and output of machines. It was still more needed with the coming of railroads and the development of global communication. This was an urban development and it remains so.

Ecuadoreans face no need of synchronizing their meetings or movements one with another, except in a loosely general fashion. Urban man must be time conscious all of his waking hours. He knows the time needed by public transport to reach his work place punctually. On the job he is continually aware of the moving of both work and time, whether his pace is too fast or too slow in relation to the flow of the work. He knows what to expect per hour from a particular machine and how the performance of each machine must keep pace with others.

After work, he knows by the wrist watch how much time he can spare for a visit with a friend before being expected at home where his clock-conscious wife is preparing the family meal.

Time discipline, centering in work places, extends to all activity in the urban agglomerate, and beyond. Transit systems keep pace with it, while stores, schools and public offices accept this clock regulation. Over the wide urban domain the clock synchronizes men and machines alike, called by some a mechanical tyranny. Probably it is no more a tyranny, except for its emphasis on punctuality, than is natural time which moves with sun and the seasons. Man has been "tyrannized" so long by natural time that he has acquired an inner adaptation to it.

As he looks at the clock or the watch on his wrist, time becomes visible for the ordinary man, as it becomes audible when he hears the hour strike. It becomes something he learns to abstract, to measure that other abstraction, money value, or such abstractions as momentum and distance in which time units are involved.[11] For the planners of work time is a factor, the measure of all factors in production; interest on capital, depreciation of machines and other property, rents, movement of products into the market, labour cost, etc. In all areas one central consideration is the elimination of waste, which also involves time considerations.

This evolution of time consciousness has profound social implications, as we see in the division of time as between work time used for production and leisure, which is largely associated with consumption. The social ramifications of each kind of time use are varied and far reaching.

The Gift of Leisure

Much that is being written about leisure concerns the increase of free time in the more industrial countries where a worker with a 40-hour work week has about 50 hours of leisure, about 30 hours more free time per week than his grandfather had. Although this gift of leisure has not yet come to developing countries; that is, leisure separated from work time, it may be present, although mixed with work time. Clearly for industrialism, the "gift" of leisure results from work efficiency. The amount is due to increase in the most industrial countries, perhaps at a slower rate.

Rural man has leisure, but he gives little thought to it. His work day has many interruptions and his yearly schedule has relaxed periods between days of hard work. He occupies himself with a diversity of tasks, with rest intervals between. Much that urban man calls leisure is activity which rural man mixes with his work. He does not need leisure any more than the urban man fortunate enough to have an absorbing occupation. It was so (allegedly) with most pre-industrial urban workers, who worked long hours producing things, getting satisfaction exercising craftsmanship. Actually, much of that work was drudgery. The change came when work was separated from the home and put in factories, when workers began selling time to employers and employers began exacting 60 minutes of production from each hour of labour purchased. In this situation any activity not related to work was excluded.[12]

Most of this leisure increase has been realized since about 1900, and most of that since World War I, when wages began to rise as weekly hours shortened. Much of the literature on leisure in the West has appeared since 1920 and much of that viewed the increase of leisure as a problem and the term "threat" was often used. Recreation as a way of using leisure became a growing interest, the basis of a movement for play and recreational facilities. The professional recreationist came to be no less important than the teacher. The literature, while oriented to leisure, was concerned more with *right* kinds of recreation for using leisure to make man more fit. The idea was that leisure should be used for getting education and self-improvement. This activity for recreation has been almost entirely urban.

Curiously perhaps, many people do not use their leisure, at least for recreation. Even when not in economic need, they look for second jobs, apparently feeling more at ease when employed. In Germany where a large but unknown proportion of the workers hold second jobs, it is argued that this practice of "working black" would increase if the 40-hour week were established. Minor studies that have been made seem to warrant the conclusion many workers like their second jobs because they work more as individuals, making their own decisions and schedules. In the United States, according to periodic studies of the Department of Labour about five per cent of all employed persons are second-job workers. Again the incentive is not so much need as the wish to be occupied. De Grazia makes the point that some people lack the ability to use leisure, free time makes them uneasy. "The sense of time becomes important in many cases of psychotherapy. The expanses of time that days off and vacations offer seem to bring to some persons a sort of fear that agoraphobics have of open spaces. Wide-open time, like space, is frightening. In like manner time pressure has its own disease, a claustrophobia in time, wherein a person feels that he is closeted up in time and can't escape."[18]

The Sphere of Non-Work

In his article, cited above, Dumazedier suggests that workers unable to use leisure actually derive a type of leisure satisfaction out of a second job. If in one's regular employment he makes no decisions, it may be satisfying to manage a little job of his own, to plan it and bring it to a conclusion. Such satisfactions from work are common to self-employed persons in technical or artistic occupations, but are rarely realized on industrial jobs. Thus, a second job may pass time and yield satisfactions as well as a little unbudgeted money.

Such second jobs would fall into the non-work category mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. A man who is a painter helps a neighbour paint his house; shows him how to mix paints to get the right colour, *how not* to spread the paint, etc. In the process he does most of the work. Thus, by working a few hours now and then, after some days the house gets painted. But the painter takes no money. His neighbour and friend is a mechanic who keeps the painter's automobile in repair, saving him a cost at the garage. As the two work together, whether painting the house or fixing the car, the painter and mechanic do much talking, stopping for coffee or some other drink now and then. By this non-work activity money is saved and free time is used. Each neighbour meets his neighbourly obligation to the other.

Non-work activity is like the in-between tasks of the rural man, called chores or "fixing things." If the urban man does not have a garden he may turn to some hobby or do-it-yourself activity. He may volunteer to be a group leader in a boys club, work with a church group or perform tasks for the political party. He may get so interested in such non-work activity that recreational leisure has no appeal.

The idea of non-work can be illustrated by another example, that of an employed married pair with a hobby interest in puppetry. They made the puppets, wrote the script for the dialogue and arranged the stage in their home. Sometimes they entertained friends and occasionally were invited to give puppet shows in hospitals and children's institutions. They now have little time for puppetry at home; it has become for them a non-work activity, one to which they are glad to give time; indeed they have little time for recreational leisure, or desire for it.

Seemingly, non-work activities increase as people become more integrated in family, neighbourhood and other group life. It serves as a work substitute and a passer of free time. It affords opportunity for developing skills and we need to add that many people use this time for study. It takes out of leisure what Mannheim calls its vagueness.[14] For many people, much that is called recreation may be of interest for a time, but non-work may be a continuing interest.

On Leisure and Consumption

Leisure activity usually involves spending money, which does not apply to commercial amusements alone. Actually, commercial amusement takes up a small part of all leisure, more time for the young than the old. Radio and television at home may be costly. Also reading at home or record playing may be expensive. Sport involves expenditures for equipment and special clothing. Outdoor recreation, such as camping, may be a luxury for some people. Many industries have emerged for no other purpose than to serve leisure and their advertisements fill the journals on recreation. It all adds up to variety in such consumer activity.

All consumer activity makes work and leisure-related consumer activity provides many new kinds of work. There have always been entertainers, but their number and variety increase. Much of recreational leisure is given to socializing; consuming special foods and drinks, wearing special clothes, whether at home or in restaurants.

The biggest cost item in the list of leisure spending is the vacation, a leisure institution of urban origin. In most urbanized countries a vacation with pay is coming to be seen as a right by most workers. While a big cost to industry, the benefits return to industry. In Western Europe the summer vacation has become such a mass movement that tourism is a major source of income for countries like Austria, Italy, Spain and Yugoslavia.

Spending for leisure provides public as well as private work. It calls for parks, playgrounds, beaches, promenades, arenas, camp grounds, facilities for winter sport. With increasing numbers of people owning motor vehicles, used for leisure as well as for work, the public highway is coming to be an important recreational facility. Public highways, normally made for work purposes, must now serve a double role. In Western Europe comes now the demand for wide roads across national borders. This is pertinent to leisure in Europe where borders once were barriers, but with the vacation becoming standard and with the idea that vacation should be spent in another country, the idea of border as barrier is losing force. Tourism grows.[15]

Private spending for leisure is difficult to identify. Estimates of spending for obviously recreational purposes range from five to ten per cent of all consumer spending. Much spending for leisure is mixed with non-leisure activity, to promote business, to gain skill or education, or to win social position. The automobile serves family recreational as well as work needs. Clothing for dance may serve also on important social occasions. Of this we are sure, leisure spending makes work, not for men alone, many new employments are created for women. Such work has done much to attract women into the labour market.[16]

Working and Living

The all too brief description of work and leisure under urbanism serves to remind us what a revolution is taking place in the life of the modern urban community. If revolution is an apt term for it, we can add with equal aptness that the revolution goes on as the ways of leisure behaviour permeate all other folkways. The urban milieu is the arena for all this, but its influence extends outward.

Urban man, with the instrumentalities of industry at his command, no longer needs to spend all his waking hours working for mere subsistence. He is beginning to win time for other things and we may call it time for living. Some may say that the great mass of ordinary people do not know the art of living, or how to live better, but the record is encouraging. In most industrial urban countries the span of life has been increased by about twenty years since 1900. The level of education in these countries is rising. In the United States from an average level of about four or five years of schooling for the total population in 1900 to an average level of nearly ten years of schooling , the level being a little higher for women than for men. Increasing percentages of youth participate in sports, in the arts, in little theatre activities and in the reading of solid books. These are only a few of the signs that mass culture is not being lowered by mass leisure.

On the material side, in the more industrial urban countries, as the work day and work week have shortened, labour productivity has steadily risen, which means that, while industrialism has given man more leisure, it has also afforded him higher levels of living. We can still ask if, with all these benefits he is learning to live the good life. Many would answer such a question in the negative. There are many views about what the good life is. Whatever our answer may be, this way of life appears to be spreading.

CHAPTER 7

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR

NOTHING could be more sociological than government, as seen in terms of its evolution; or more social than political behaviour, when the diverse interactions identified as political are scrutinized. Government is the most recent system of social control, although much interlaced with earlier ones designed to maintain order in communal life. The earlier systems were vague systems of rules enforced by group pressures. Then came a system with definite rules and institutions, impersonal in its operation and definite in its penalties. This type, says Shepard, is government. "The distinction between the two forms is not an absolutely sharp one, and there is often a considerable intermingling."[1] The first system of authority is human and wavering in its application, depending on the persons involved, the immediate situation and the prevailing emotions; the second is firmly oriented to considered rules which are impersonally adhered to. When the rules are written they are called law.

The urban community is one of law and its system of authority is government which is the only system logically suited for controlling the diverse and changing life in this agglomerate type of society. The relations of people with this authority, to be directed by it or to control and manipulate it, are identified as political behaviour. It is social behaviour of a particular kind, as economic behaviour is another special kind. Since the urban society is not one of so many individuals or families on the one side and government on the other, but one in which many formal groups also exist, political behaviour may assume diverse forms. For example, it may be quasi-political in relationships between mass secondary groups. A dispute between litigants which is resolved "outside the court" may result in a compromise, each party recognizing the power of the court in the background.

These and other social aspects of government and political behaviour will be considered in this chapter.

The Market and the Citadel

Through the centuries it was often the king in whom final authority in the community rested, while the citizens in conformity with such authority, or in an approximate conformity with it regulated their affairs. Also, and not in violation of this public authority, citizens have always had their systems of private authority in their mores and institutions.

The beginning of the city as an agglomeration around a seat of authority was an opportunity for citizens to accumulate private property, the effective utilization of which called for the creation of properties of another kind, those belonging to the central authority whose existence depended on their presence. There had to be a market place as well as streets for access to the market, perhaps buildings for collective use. Arendt makes this observation, "Society, when it first entered the public realm, assumed the disguise of an organization of property owners who, instead of claiming access to the public realm because of their wealth, demanded protection from it for the accumulation of more wealth." Assuming that the king also had property and power objectives, the protection which only he could give was assured, for he too needed to be secure. "Only the government, appointed to shield the private owners from each other in the competitive struggle for wealth, was common."[2] While the king may not have been a chosen or appointed authority, he did have a common interest with the citizens in the market.

By whatever evolution the public authority in the city took form, it assumed the right to hold in trust the collective assets of the community, to keep the record of the community, to guard its good name and to maintain order. Despite endless examples of tyranny, corruption, neglect and sheer stupidity, the tradition of a public authority ethic was never extinguished. As Mumford regards it, this authority is symbolized by the citadel. In its more crude beginnings the citadel where the king and his representatives, soldiers and money counters lived and ruled was a stronghold surrounded by a wall. Within the wall surpluses of food were stored, a means of controlling the population. The market and most of the people were outside the wall. As citizens accumulated property it became expedient to extend the wall to bring the market and substantial homes inside.[3] The citadel changed but without losing its authority function. The function became institutionalized into what eventually became the bureaucracy system of municipal government.

Without the market there would have been no need for the citadel, and without the citadel the market could not have evolved. In this relationship is seen an essential division of labour between public and private work. Public authority protected the market and set the rules for its operation, established exchange values, weights and measures, and public authority kept the pace. Because of the market, the city became the centre of many kinds of work, which provided the sustenance enabling the public authority to carry on. The more diversified the market became, the more varied the duties of the public authority with regard to it. These duties related in part to the local uses of the market and in part to market relationships with distant places.

While promoting and protecting the market, the public authority had to be no less responsible for order, both in the market and in the rest of the community. This civil authority has now a full-grown responsibility for a great variety of functions, which it acknowledges, however well they may be performed. Since the city no longer lives within walls, observes Gottmann, it begins to have various functions within its region, and ties of interdependence with its hinterland. It is surrounded by towns and villages that are part of its life economically, socially, culturally, even technologically, although it may be detached from them politically.[4] They may scorn the authority of the city, yet they are dependent upon it for services which they themselves cannot provide; libraries, zoological gardens, museums, botanical gardens, universities, theatre, and that institution of contact, the newspaper.

Cities have always had a dominant role in relation to their hinterlands and that role continues although it is based on force but on exchange and urban leadership. The city must cultivate its market hinterland like a garden. Moreover, cities can raise their own levels of living, culture and education easier if these levels in the hinterland also rise. These are functions which authority in the city can promote, but it cannot assume political responsibility for them.

Urban authority, still in the ancient role of citadel, performs functions without precedent in urban life. None is more important than education, once a family responsibility only, and now civil authority must concern itself with recreation. Health service has always been an accepted responsibility of the citadel, but today the health function is a complex of services utilizing the advances of technology and the discoveries of science. The citadel had to evolve as the market became more of a city within which the citadel has become a bureaucracy.

Evolution of Urban Government

Robson edited a stimulating comparative study of government in more than twenty world cities. One is impressed on reading this volume with the complexity of government in each of these cities, although each has its own kind of complexity. Although not one government appears adequate to the demands upon it, each is in the midst of change and each appears to be striving to overtake its problems. Probably this was no less true in 1900, although great advances have been made since. It will doubtless be equally true in the year 2000, however much advance is made before then. The tradition for service may seem to be neglected at times, but never is it relinquished, even in seemingly chaotic, experience-rich London. Yet in emergencies London has been able to rise and get things done.[5]

This is often the complaint against urban government; it is slow to act on chronic problems. It provides too little, arrives too late and is too much administered by the hands of dead men.[6] In street improvements, water extensions, sewer improvements, the erection of modern schools, and in making plans for growth it is sometimes years behind schedule. In some countries the national governments show greater interest in urban problems than do municipal governments. The answer usually given to such complaints is that the alertness or sluggishness of a municipal government reflects the alertness or sluggishness of the citizens and the secondary groups found in the city.

The findings of various studies of Indian cities lead to the conclusion that urban government has lagged considerably behind in providing adequate housing, water supply and sewage facilities, recreational installations and so on. Even in such a planned industrial city as Jamshedpur the planners have ignored the amenities (water supply, playgrounds, open spaces and parks) which are necessary for healthy urban life. In Bombay, Calcutta, Kanpur most of the educational institutions, overflowing with children, do not have open spaces and parks for recreation. It appears that the failure to plan properly by the civil authorities reflects the value system governing the life of the community in which they were brought up.

A local government will be most active regarding functions in which there is an urgent community interest; good roads for access to the city or health service for which public authority would be open to immediate and severe criticism if the function is neglected. But the same city may lag in providing play facilities for children or water supply in a slum area. However, even the slowest-moving municipal authority today is infinitely more alert and understandingly responsible than most cities were two centuries ago, which in most cases is not enough. Much of this advance over pre-industrial cities has taken place during the past century. For example, sewers in most cities as of 1800 were not used to remove household waste but to drain water from the streets. Gas and electricity for lighting did not arrive until about a century ago; thus, street lighting is recent. For centuries some cities have had cobble stone paving in streets, but only in the mid-town section, which means that paved streets and sidewalks over wide areas is quite recent.

Most of the social advances in municipal administration had to wait until the reform movements of the nineteenth century. The handling of prisoners, the treatment of the insane, the care of orphan children and services for the aged and infirm were generally crude and cruel, actually matters of little public concern. Without such concern reform is unlikely. Rarely have public services and institutions been self-reforming; that comes as citizen groups become interested or aroused.

Today in the more developed regions and urban centres the situation is reversed, which brings to attention an element in government which is both new and heartening. It is illustrated in the higher standards for administration in welfare matters (prisoners, the insane, orphans, the aged and infirm, the shelterless). The change came because of pressure from reform groups when social services were placed in the hands of a new type of public servant. Gradually the standards of public service have come under the influence of this "public service revolution," much of it taking place since about 1900. It has moved fast in so short a time.

Professionalism in Public Service

The Bürgermeister in a German city holds a position encased in honourable tradition. He is "father" of his community, and this holds for other countries in Western Europe, and there are many stories of sacrifices by these head officials of cities. However, the German city today has another official whose position is non-traditional, the city director. He has no ceremonial functions and very little authority. His job is non-political, much like that of the city manager in American and Canadian cities. He is a professional, university trained, much as the manager in an industry. He is informed about all public services and their quality, being alert to discover their faults and he knows what additional services and facilities are needed. He knows the sources and amounts of municipal income and he is continually on guard against the waste of public funds. He does not administer municipal affairs; he provides the information that makes good administration possible.

Professionalism in public office means that the holder of a position in a public department has been trained for it, having had twelve years or more of basic education plus training in a special school, which may be within a university or a separate institution. It would depend on the branch of the municipal service; office worker, fireman, social worker, attorney, policeman, medical assistant, engineer, sanitary expert, etc. Professionalism means more than training; it includes an attitude the professional person has toward himself and a jealousy he has for the integrity of his work. This attitude has given rise to such controls as these :

1. Support of the standards for work performance, and the

duties as written into the description of the work required;
2. Keeping written records of work performed which enter the official files, so that each official act performed is accompanied by the essential information in writing which can be examined later;
3. Maintaining one's personal record of experience and performance, which is a cumulative record kept in the official files;
4. Being continually aware of one's professional reputation and taking pride in maintaining a record of efficient performance; and
5. Also being aware that one's status as a public servant is high or low as his performance is judged by his professional colleagues either in his own or in other departments.

Opposed to the professional model is the old political model which assumes that the holder of a public office, whether efficient or not, has the first claim upon it, and this claim may extend to the presumed right to employ members of one's family to hold positions under his supervision, whatever their qualifications. The companion assumption under the political model is that the party in power has the right to replace public servants with members loyal to the party in power. Urban government as it formerly existed in the American cities in line with this ideal was known as the "spoils system," the spoils going to the victors in the election. The efficiency of business or industrial management is frustrated if the municipal government is indifferently, inefficiently or corruptly administered.

As a result of public opposition to the spoils system, American cities from 1910 onward have been adopting and enforcing civil service ordinances, which insure the job security of public servants of good record. The civil service codes tend increasingly to raise the standards for recruitment. The professionally qualified public servant is thus secure against the machinations of the politician.[7] With civil service codes calling for professional performance, municipal government is less bedevilled by nepotism and favouritism than formerly. Nepotism has never been a tradition in American politics, politicians are wary of it, but favouritism has been quite common. Nepotism is accepted in business and industry, but normally it is found in the self-employed occupations or among managers and owners.

Nepotism is not itself an evil, being concrete evidence of family solidarity. In agriculture, in the handwork small enterprises and other forms of pre-industrial work it serves well. It may be an evil in the public service if the official places relatives in positions they are not qualified to hold. It leads to mal-performance, non-performance and often to mis-performance. This has been one of the obstacles to efficiency in municipal government in Latin American countries.[8]

Rationality in Public Service

Urban sociologists rarely join with those who complain about the impersonalism of urban life, which to them is a normal characteristic of mass living. If a million people live in an area of a hundred square miles, no individual can be expected to know the faces and names of more than a thousand of these, and he may know with some degree of intimacy not more than a hundred. Numerically, that would be his measure of acquaintance in a rural community. In the city he hardly has time for a wider acquaintance. He may have contacts with many without knowing their names. Yet, working and living in the city, he needs to behave in some respects to the entire agglomerate. He invents ways of behaving toward people without knowing or needing to know them. The relationships are impersonal and anonymous. Obviously there are degrees of anonymity and impersonalism.

In order to live in a meaningful relation to the mass, urban man creates the organizations we have already described, which is a rational approach to the city. These are normally impersonal in their functioning. Ascriptive groups, characteristic of the village cannot serve the purposes for which secondary organizations are designed, but they can exist in the city, serving in a minor sphere. These primary groups are rarely rational, while secondary groups are rarely other than rational.

Urban government is such a secondary organization, the only one that includes all the community, and all must have membership in it, which makes it public. All other secondary organizations are private, each including but a part of the total public. All these including government, are rational in that each has a specific purpose. Each proceeds in calculated ways to achieve its purpose according to agreed rules and by actions which are matters of record. Community affairs, as they involve collective interests, are managed largely by these organizations, or jointly by them and government. Urban government is called complex, but so are these private organizations; especially are they complex when we consider the interrelations between them. To the extent that they share with government the management of community affairs, their behaviour is hardly less political than the behaviour of government.

It is often said, and truly, that good government is insured only by continuous vigilance on the part of citizens. In the urban community the citizen would find it difficult to participate as an individual. Were all citizens to do so, the result would be confusion, they are better, at least more powerfully represented by their organizations, which are often identified as pressure groups. On practically every problem which must be faced by public authority different, often opposing, demands will be made by different pressure groups, which makes it all the more imperative for the public authority, representing the whole community, to utilize the knowledge and advice of its professional functionaries. A decision on any problem may be a compromise between opposing viewpoints, but it will be a rational one.

Private enterprise, organized to perform work, normally uses rational methods for advancing its own interests, which applies in particular to the large enterprise. This means that work is purposeful and understandable. Work relationships within the establishment must be oriented to work outside, as it may concern the purposes of the enterprise. Most work in the modern community, whether performed in small or large enterprises, is related. It cannot go forward effectively in one work place if performance is ineffective in other work places. Thus each work enterprise tends to make efficiency demands on the others. The pertinence of this observation about private work to the different works and services of the public authority becomes obvious when we recognize how involved government becomes in the many kinds of work in the community.

Rational and efficient private work calls for rational and efficient public work.[9] Inefficient, tardy, or indifferent public performance is frustrating to private activity, whether private activity relates to work or to leisure. Whether at work or play, people use and need roads and bridges, police and fire protection, responsible sanitary and health service, inspections for health and safety (foods, buildings, work place for hazards, motor vehicles), enforcement of contracts and prevention of fraud and corruption.

The difference between rationalism and efficiency in the public service and in the private enterprise is that the public service is *socially motivated;* it represents all the community. The private organization represents only its members and the private enterprise for work only its owners.

Widening Urban Interdependence

Another aspect of community life, one that concerns the behaviour of both public bodies and private organizations, is the multiple-contact network between a city and the towns and villages that surround it. This network may also reach to other cities. Except for the exchange of luxury goods, ancient cities were content to be somewhat isolated from one another. Villages also tended to develop self-isolating attitude,[10] a natural attitude for early villages, since each has a relatively self-sufficient economy.

The modern city fears isolation, which is evidenced by its interest in developing access routes. It is not enough to have free access to sources of supply in its immediate hinterland; if the city will grow, the routes must be extended and the hinterland sphere of influence widened. This is largely a private concern, but it may call for some public performance for its implementation. Amsterdam is a prominent port largely because of a canal to the North Sea. This, like a road, was a service to private enterprise but it was provided as a public work. Houston, Texas regards itself as the main seaport of that region, although more than thirty miles from the sea. Deep-water vessels come and go by a ship canal, a gigantic public work initiated by the municipality of Houston. Without the canal this would be only another middle-rank city, but private groups knew how to use government to get an important work done. The benefits go to the whole community. Getting things done by making use of government is commendable political activity.

Amsterdam, Houston or Manchester, England (also an inland city with a ship canal), by getting access to wider areas involve themselves in wider contact and exchange networks. These networks vary in extent and complexity from one city to another, embracing greater or smaller areas which reflect the reach of the influence of each city Various students of these urban networks have endeavoured to advance certain generalizations about how communities of different sizes and types tend to form into patterns around central cities, the idea being that the size and role of each community is determined largely by the roles and sizes of other communities in the network.[11] Between the communities in such a network there would be a relationship expressed in a division of labour and interdependence.

These relationships of economic interdependence between cities and their satellites give rise to political interests and political behaviours peculiar to each particular region. A good example would be Strasbourg on the French side of the Rhine. Because of the national border with Germany, heretofore a barrier, the natural hinterland of Strasbourg on the German side of the Rhine did not develop. With the present French-German official policy to reduce and finally neutralize this barrier, the fortunes of Strasbourg will improve. Its hinterland, heretofore a half-circle will become a full circle, while the pattern of communities will be enlarged, making a more varied interdependence between city and satellites. With this enlarging of the hinterland will come new problems for the municipalities; Strasbourg as central city and its satellite towns.[12]

There is only one limit to the outward extension of an urban network of interdependence in trade and work, and that limit is the world itself. Thus we speak of one metropolis or another as being a world city; Bombay or Hamburg, Calcutta or London, New York or Tokyo. How interdependent these cities can be in their global networks was dramatically illustrated by the dock strike in the United States during January 1963. Not only were hundreds of ships idled in American ports, most of them in the New York harbour, but hundreds of ships in ports of other world cities were idled. Not only were American industries forced to close temporarily, but a number of industries in Europe had to cease operations until the strike ended.

Public and Private Government

When a group of citizens organize a partnership or corporation for a particular purpose certain assumptions are implied: for example, that :

1. They have a right to form such a group;
2. Through the organization objectives can be attained which the members could not achieve so well as individuals,
3. Agreements reached among members of the organization, which are not contrary to law will be sustained by the law; and
4. The organization has the right to establish rules for managing its affairs, and these rules may be enforced by the duly elected officials of the organization.

Individuals who share in forming such an organization, and others who join later, recognize that for the organization to accomplish its purposes and for getting things done in inner discipline is necessary. This has been called a type of private government, although not in conflict with public authority.[13]

The trade unions involved in the above mentioned dock strike are nation-wide organizations, having branches or "locals" in each port. The leaders have the authority to bargain with the shipping associations, the employers. They may not call a strike without the majority vote of the union members. Once the strike gets under way, the central authority of the union becomes complete. It issues instructions which are carried out by the locals. Members who do not cooperate are penalized. This is private government, but within the permissive limits of civil law.[14] All private groups within the community exercise some type and degree of authority over their members; indeed, it is as organizations are able to maintain discipline and wisely use this authority that their strength can be known.

Each organized group, as much as each industrial enterprise, looks to the civil authority in the community for protection and at times for benefits. Some groups may be interested only in promoting and protecting the public welfare. Such a group may be demanding improvements in educational facilities, the creation of more recreation facilities and services, slum clearance and so on. Perhaps such organizations will be joined in their demands by church groups, trade unions and social groups. Since their demands would call for increased public expenditures and higher taxes, the property owners and employer groups would resist such efforts. In some countries the initiative for general welfare programs would be taken by the city authorities. They would form committees made up of representatives from the different groups. In other countries, especially in the United States, the initiative lies with the private groups. The public authority moves in one direction or another as known public opinion and the relative pressure of the organized groups, a display of strength, is made manifest. In such situations the public authority assumes that the leaders of the private organizations speak for their members, which is akin to recognizing that they exercise some control over the members.

American sociologists tend to assume that the individual in the city normally participates in community life by joining various secondary organizations. On the basis of this assumption, many "community participation" studies have been made. According to most of these studies, only a minority of all urban adults are linked with private organizations. The conclusion is that citizen participation in community life is low. It is possible that citizens participate in other effective ways in the life of the community; this is a question that invites research.

The influence of private organizations is illustrated in another way. For example, the sociologist knows that if he would carry out any research in the city he can proceed easier with the work if he has the cooperation, at least the good will, of organizations interested in the problems under study. On the other hand, without this cooperation, the research effort might be difficult. The cooperation of the organized interest groups may be an asset because their records may be helpful. This opens the way for contact with members of such organizations. If the research worker is able to get the cooperation of the interested private organizations and the public offices concerned, he is also in a position to study relationships between public authorities and private organizations in the area of his problem.

The Professional Politician

No specialist in the urban community is more maligned or more misunderstood than the type of functionary who makes politics an occupation, often because he has a liking and talent for such activity. He may hold public office, but frequently he does not, being a functionary of a political party. He may not be competent to discuss the theory of government with the political scientist, but he knows how his government operates at the ground level He exists in all political systems and no city is without his counterpart. He makes it his business to manipulate the machinery of government to get things done, usually small services which may be vitally important to ordinary individuals. He can be most effective if his party is in power, but if his party is not in power he still finds ways to function. If political power is won by votes, he knows how to garner the votes. If power is held by a dictator, he is till there, functioning differently, perhaps, but still making himself useful both to the ordinary man and the political machine. His importance is often overlooked by students of urban life.

In some cities the professional politician is an office holder, and he may prefer to be, if that gives the desired status in the area where he operates. Elsewhere he may be engaged in some business, sometimes a marginal kind of business which would be frowned on by the elite, but not by the people in his district. His species may also be found in the better-class districts where he may dress differently, display different manners and he may engage in a more approved business, but his in-between political role is about the same. He specializes in that kind of political know-how looking after the interests of people whose problems involve the complexities of law and government.

To the practical politician government is an unthinking mechanism which in its operation hurts many while it may help a few, and the many need to be protected against it. Government can be used by some for great gain but, as he sees it, this may be to the great disadvantage of others. He stands instinctively on the side of those who get hurt.

The professional politician is not a reformer of city government; rather, he has a chronic suspicion of and dislike for political reformers. Corruption in government does not outrage him, except "excessive" corruption in opposition parties. He is no friend of professionalism in the public service because that leads to "red tape." In his thinking any ordinary person with a common school education and common sense can perform in most public positions.

In areas of the city where poverty is greatest and unemployment highest, where people in their understanding of municipal government are far from the ideal of an informed citizenry, and where few people know how to approach public authority, there the professional politician is at home. There he is needed and trusted. He knows how to get the son of a widow out of jail and how to protect a landlord against arrest because the sanitary conditions in his houses are below the legal minimum. He can help the son of a neighbourhood storekeeper get a job as a policeman. He finds ways of doing favours for the owner of a local factory, and the owner in turn will give employment to someone recommended by the politician. His importance lies in the fact that many people are overwhelmed, not by the life of the city, but by the complexities confronting them when they must make contact with public authority. He is to the poor in the slums what the high-priced attorney is to the rich man, but the attorney whose performance may not be more efficient is much more honoured.[15]

The professional politician is not destroyed by reform drives to get honest men into public office. His power is weakened only as the educational and living level of the people rise. He would change his behaviour and still find work to do. He is most hurt as the functioning of urban government comes into the hands of trained, professional public servants. The problem of the social science is not to abolish the professional politician, but to find ways of using him. He is normally a person of good motivations; indeed, a social resource.

CHAPTER 8

SOCIAL WELFARE UNDER URBANISM

LIKE other aspects of modern urban life, welfare is very different from anything in human experience which may have served the same purpose. Welfare of some sort has always existed, much as the family has always existed in some form. It may be that welfare was a basic reason for the family. With the emergence of the modern urbanism and industrial work welfare is being redefined, in the sense that work is being redefined · that is, becoming depersonalized, detached from social duty in the person to person sense, motivated more by social justice than sentiment. This evolution and some of its implications will be examined in the present chapter.

Antiquity of Welfare

Because of complete helplessness in his infancy, relative helplessness in his youth and partial helplessness in his old age, man is compelled to depend for security on the good will of his fellows for a period which may have been equal to a fifth or sixth of his life span during his primitive beginnings. That period of dependency tends to be extended in the beginning years as civilization advances. Probably the age at which a young person graduates from a university today is equal to more than half the life expectancy of primitive people. This burden that human beings accept in rearing their young, if it is not called welfare, is a form of generation to generation debt cancellation; parents in return for care received in their childhood, render a similar service to their children.

Primitive welfare was not limited to the parent-child relationship; it was rather a social compact involving the whole community and its ramifications were varied. The division of labour, for example, was such that more was expected of the young and strong than of the old and weak. This was probably accepted by the young and strong in the knowledge that one day they would be old and weak. Power in the primitive community was so distributed and ownership in property so ordered, that one accumulated both power and property in the process of aging, so that the weakening of his body was compensated by a strengthening of one's prestige. This was, indeed a kind of welfare system and one that was not based on sentiment.

Primitive welfare had its mutual security aspects which were equally practical; the whole group had to be concerned about violent dangers, starvation and other risks, and each had to do what was thought best for the group in any crisis. Doubtless the security system was rationalized somehow connecting it with the supernatural but, however the system operated, it was logically oriented to the risks of life for the whole community. Sentiments such as charity, brotherhood and joy of giving were not involved.

Early welfare system apparently assumed a division of responsibility. Within the community, the lineage group was expected to care for its own members as far as need was concerned, whereas all lineage groups joined in safeguarding the crop against a flood. It was not the community as a whole that assumed responsibility for the feeble or crippled person, these had to look to their own kin. In that community the aged ones enjoyed the prime advantages of the security system.[1]

Even welfare systems that prevailed in the Middle Ages of Europe were of the tradition-sustained, local-community type which held each family responsible for the care of its own, while the community group joined in wider obligations not unique to the family, or cases of kin need too great for the family. These systems of welfare in one respect were less realistically oriented than those of more primitive communities. They were given religious motivations; thus, if one did good for a brother or neighbour, he would be rewarded in some way here or hereafter. In a great variety of ways a religious orientation entered into most human relationships. Welfare came to mean decency and fair play in all sorts of transactions. One did not cheat a widow, overtax a horse or overwork a servant, as he was also tolerant of the old and protective of the young. If from his own substance he gave to those in need, that was one way of storing up treasures in heaven, and there was one belief to the effect that if one did not pay a debt in this life, he would have to pay fourfold in the next life. Welfare was the central motivation for groups coming together, holding together, and acting together in various advancement and security arrangements. But the strong did not push down the weak. This was Christian charity.

As some villages grew larger to become towns or as some towns became cities, this ongoing system of welfare was still retained as the central motivation of community life. The new English towns tried to retain the village system of government, the village idea of neighbourhood life and the village tradition of mutual welfare and charity. These systems served well for the homogeneous village, but the new town built around the factory was not a homogeneous community. It was rapidly becoming the habitat of strangers, and the stranger made the difference, but he was the essential element for the new urban life. Family responsibility weakened, often to ineffectiveness. Collective primary welfare responsibility could not function in the community of strangers.

But the ideal of mutual primary welfare began to find other forms of expression as small groups joined into small insurance schemes.[2] Actually, that was what the craft guilds had been doing since the Middle Ages, but the craft guild was not a force in these new industrial cities. They joined together as large families, each guild assuming the welfare of its own members. Often guild members lived clustered in the same street. The survival of separate wards of artisans in Indian cities strongly supports the view that the artisans lived a life of their own, apart from the rest of the community. The clustered dwellings of artisans are grouped even now in such a way as to preserve their traditional occupations, family relationships, kinship obligations and caste solidarity. The modern forces, as a matter of fact, are being used by them to reorganize their economic activities in the world of competition, thus reinforcing their group solidarity. Thus they can perhaps continue doing so long as their kind of work remains in demand and is not taken over by the factory.

As the now extinct guild "took care of its own," so many artisan groups in Indian cities still do. For group welfare reasons, the guilds often went to the extreme of selecting marriage partners for younger workers, in order not to weaken the group by bringing in outsiders.[3]

The guilds stood for a family-centered type of security, but the trade unions of the industrial era were individual-centered from the outset. However, the trade unions in most industrial countries until about 1890 were too preoccupied with fighting for the legal right to exist for giving much thought to welfare reform. Cities were slow to assume welfare responsibility, except in emergencies or in cases of extreme need. The tradition prevailed that welfare was first a family responsibility and secondly the responsibility of private groups; mutual-aid groups, churches or the organized charities.

Attitudes Regarding Public Welfare

Welfare as a public service in Western countries is largely an evolution of the past hundred years, and the story of this evolution is crude and brutal. For example, when the "poor house" was instituted, it became a "catch-all" depository for all types of socially rejected persons, the aged, the crippled, orphans, the insane, all treated as if delinquents. The matter of their care was given over to contractors who were profit-motivated. The cruelty of the poor houses helped to stir various reform movements.

Whatever the quality of public welfare, to the extent it existed it was presumed to be a right, although it was administered in keeping with the stern aspects of the charity attitude. One who received public aid found himself humiliated in different ways, nor was it less humiliating to receive aid from a private charity organization. Yet the idea of charity as a system of giving was highly extolled. John Wesley, the English religious reformer of the 18th century, in his famous sermon on money laid down three rules for its use, (1) get all you can, (2) save all you can, and (3) give all you can.[4] The amount that one would give was left to the conscience of the individual. In Wesley's thinking, it was not wrong to get money and to save; it was wrong not to save as it was also wrong not to give. What one saved was for his own care in a time of need.

Critics of the charity system, besides objecting to its sentimentality, charged that the gift is not measured against the need, that in the urban community the giver and the recipient are strangers. The human touch, which ideally must accompany charity cannot be realized in this anonymous contact, and the real problems of the needy are not being faced. Curiously, it was in this urban community where the idea of charity became institutionalized, although its faults there were most glaring.[5]

A second criticism of charity concerns the negative attitudes engendered by it. The giver may enjoy a virtuous feeling about himself but he will have a lesser opinion of the recipient who is often seen as one who will not look for honest work, who spends his money on drink or other vices, who never saved his money, and whose need is due to faults of his own. Those who turn to charity in time of need are well aware of such attitudes, which they themselves would share if not in need. The well-intentioned man will hesitate long, perhaps too long, before accepting charity, knowing well what neighbours and friends will say about him. In the modern community such assistance is called by some other name, "relief," for example, but the negative attitude toward it is the same. It was not given as a right.

In most Western countries during the period of emerging industrialism many mutual-aid groups were formed. In England these were known as "friendly societies," the idea being approved by Parliament in 1793 by passing the "Act for the Encouragement of Friendly Societies." Such a group, as quoted by Beveridge, was "a society of good fellowship for the purpose of raising from time to time, by voluntary contributions, a stock or fund for the mutual relief and maintenance of all and every, the members thereof, in old age, sickness, and infirmity, or for the relief of widows and children of deceased members."[6] Obviously, the small amounts collected rarely sufficed to pay the funeral costs of a deceased member. The virtue of the friendly society, pitifully small the help it gave, was its detachment from charity. It was aid that came as a right.

Voluntary societies for giving aid to others began to take form in Britain about 1850. The Industrial Revolution had already been under way more than half a century. Most of these were inspired by religious and reform purposes. Their aim was to teach the poor in the right ways of living and give a small measure of help, but they would also awaken the public to the social problems of the day. As one historian wrote, they would "comfort the afflicted and afflict the comfortable." This awakening of a community consciousness was no passing fad; it gained momentum with each year. It became the socially approved thing for the wealthy and fashionable classes to "do something for charity." The movement spread to the United States and to countries on the Continent.[7]

It was out of the charitable activities of such voluntary agencies that the modern idea of public welfare came. In the United States the old charity organizations were most active between 1930 and 1940 in establishing rational programmes of public welfare. They moved from sentimentalism to rationalism.[8]

Areas of Social Welfare

From the 1880's until after 1900, where there was reform agitation in the industrial cities, attention was focused on poverty. "Poverty" or "the poor" were commonly-used words in the titles of books of that period. There was a tendency to see most social problems in some relation to poverty. There was the assumption, one that later was argued by the labour unions, that if people can but rise above the poverty line many other problems would disappear.[9] This interest in poverty led to the pioneer survey of the *Life and Labour of the People in London,* started by Charles Booth in 1886. Actually, such studies to expose poverty as a mass phenomenon showed that the poverty of one man was not the same as that of another.

When governments reached the point of recognizing that welfare was also a public responsibility, it became apparent that the different kinds of "poverty" had to be distinguished. Thus, Germany's first venture into public welfare was a sickness insurance programme, established in 1883, followed by an accident insurance programme in 1884, with old-age and invalidity insurance coming in 1889. Out of the pool called "poverty" certain categories of need were taken. But Germany hesitated about unemployment insurance, a really vital category, which did not arrive until 1927. Most industrial countries following the first world war began to establish systems of public welfare, a development that moved faster after the second world war.[10]

The transition in welfare from general to categorical thinking and toward a rational public welfare administration is mandatory when public money is being spent, whether for welfare or any other purpose. This also holds for types of private welfare, insurance funds for example, since government must assume responsibility for their financial integrity; the purposes for which money is spent must be specific. If a welfare benefit is to be paid, the recipient must qualify according to established criteria. If a person qualified for an old-age pension, which comes to him as a right, he needs but to meet the conditions. Public welfare is often called categorical because of the categories under which it is received. The following are the more generally recognized areas in the public welfare field. They are differently defined and interrelated from one country to another.

1. *Unemployment and underemployment*
   Whether the individual is unemployed or not employed full time, it is assumed that he is willing and able to work full time, and if employed full time he would be self-supporting. It is also assumed that, whether the individual is unemployed or underemployed, it is not due to conditions over which he has control, and that he is seeking employment. If unemployment insurance exists, it is assumed that this will support the jobless person for a period until employment can be found. If the unemployment payments are not adequate, he may be given public assistance (5 below). Funds are collected from the industries, usually equal amounts from employers and workers, government assuming the cost of administration.
2. *Widows and lone persons with children*
   This type of welfare is not in the insurance class; it is a sharing by the state in the cost of children. It is assumed that without the aid the widow or other lone person with children might not be financially able to care for the children and educate them. For this kind of welfare for each case is handled according to its circumstances. Often this cost is shared by local and national government, or local and state government.
3. *Old age and disability*

Where an old-age insurance programme exists, retirement from employment is permitted or required at a certain age (in most countries 65 years for men and 60 years for women), but in case of physical disability the person may retire earlier. Upon retirement, the pension begins. Upon the death of the insured person the pension, or part of it, may be paid to the surviving spouse or other dependents. The amount of the pension is determined by years contributions were made and the amount of contributions and level of income. The insurance tax is usually paid in part by the worker and in part by the employer.

4. *Sickness and accidents*

   These categories include persons temporarily or indefinitely unable to work, those not seriously ill or injured as well as those who need occupational rehabilitation. Some countries have accident insurance but do not have health insurance. In a country like Britain with an all-embracing health insurance the two types of insurance (health and accident) are administered in close cooperation. Separately or jointly, these insurance schemes are difficult to administer. In some countries the total cost of accident insurance is taken from the employer. In other countries both types of insurance are a shared cost.

5. *General relief, or public assistance*

   This is a welfare service for meeting various unusual non-categorical problems of need. The costs are shared by the different levels of government. Public assistance, for example, may be asked to give supplementary aid to persons receiving other public benefits, pensions or unemployment benefits which are not adequate. Most of these demands for assistance are temporary.

In some countries the blind are in a special category. War veterans or war victims may be in privileged categories

Although most public welfare services are administered in the localities where the people live, the financing of each programme may be unique, which means that national, state and local government come to some different conclusion for meeting the cost of each programme; each level endeavouring to unload the cost on the others. From year to year there will be compromises, which means that the welfare system of each country becomes increasingly complex. Each programme with its own adherents and beneficiaries develops its own type of bureaucracy; indeed, each programme becomes its own kind of habit system. But all these programmes for welfare tend to have one quality in common; they are rationally administered and those who are served receive benefits as a matter of right.

Public and Private Social Welfare

In his book on public welfare administration, White is all but silent on the voluntary social agencies. At one point he makes these observations about them:

> The establishment of a private agency may have occurred as an experiment, as a means of meeting a pressing need in the community for which there was no existing agency, or for the purpose of enhancing the personal prestige of some individual or group. The essential characteristic of such an agency is its privateness. It may accept or reject cases in accordance with the concept of case load held by its sponsors, or as available funds permit. It may cease to exist on the motion of its governing body. It is financed by private donations; nobody is legally obligated to contribute. But the public agency is created by elected representatives of the people who presumably act in response to a demand on the part of the citizens. The same or other representatives of the people levy taxes to finance the agency. By its very nature the agency must serve all persons who are eligible under the statute or ordinance, it cannot limit its case load arbitrarily, except when the exhaustion of funds makes curtailment inescapable.[11]

A further observation is added regarding the difficulty between private agencies to coordinate their work, and he might have added that this difficulty often exists between public agencies from city to city. This judgement by White is not only harsh, it smacks a little of bias. The private welfare agencies in the urban community cannot be brushed aside so lightly; they perform various unique services which the more cumbersome public agencies cannot accept. Many persons in need may not qualify for any public service, they may need help until the public agency is able to act.

Actually public and private welfare agencies are not in competition, rather there tends to be a division of labour between the two. The public agency as a professional service may reflect the community conscience but, unless the conscientious workers in the public agencies are sustained and encouraged, criticised, sometimes defended, they are likely to fade into obscurity and lapse into routine public functionaries. This supplementary role is performed by the private agencies of social welfare. Some such groups in the community is needed in a counterpart role to each set of public officials. The private agency has other roles which are essential to the community and which cannot be performed by the public agency. It can openly criticise various elected officials of the municipality. It can take sides with or against other private organizations.

Moreover, a private agency for welfare may represent a particular racial, ethnic or cultural group. A trade union may have on its staff one or more trained social workers. They do not constitute a private welfare agency, but they may very well represent the welfare interests of a portion of the community.

In different ways the private agency for social service still symbolizes the sentiments of different groups toward welfare. Churches may hold to a definite policy with respect to social welfare. A church welfare service affords an opportunity for a worker to visit a family in need or in trouble, thus demonstrating that the church has an interest in them. Actually the church welfare worker may not extend any material aid at all, which is true of other private welfare workers ; they advise the individual or family where to go and how to apply for public aid.

Finally, there are certain private welfare agencies that specialize in certain kinds of social problems ; in some areas of health, mental disorders, the placement of children in homes, the promotion of recreation programmes. Some of these may become specialized pressure groups. Each such private agency in its field may be better informed about its particular field of activity than could be expected of the public welfare agency. It may not only be better informed, it has much more freedom to move about and to articulate its purposes.[12]

A public department of welfare takes its instructions from the law. It may advise legislators about what is needed in the way of law, but frequently it must wait for the private agency to speak for the public. If the law-making body is slow and conservative, the public department cannot speak up and criticise. This can be done by the private agency. This is exactly what private welfare agencies in some countries have been doing for years, notably in Britain, called by some a "welfare state," the ideal for which came from these private organizations.

Welfare Enters a Secondary Realm

Much of the evolution in the welfare systems of countries has been in at the institutional or organizational level, being not so much a product of folk thinking. There has been folk pressure for welfare reform. The beginnings of public welfare and the exposure of the brutalities in early forms of public welfare were the result mainly of agitation on the part of reformers and intellectuals, not on the part of affilicted people. Slum reform was not initiated by slum people. With respect to welfare this observation is pertinent; once the movement in the direction of public welfare got under way, then people began to make demands upon it. This may illustrate a comment by Galbraith that as people gain some security, they begin to want more of it; "moving from a world where people had little to one where they had much more to protect. In the first world misfortune and suffering were endemic and unavoidable. In the second they have become episodic and avoidable."[13]

Once public welfare responsibility was assumed on a large scale, it was necessary to introduce into this service certain standards for effective operation which were not in the old traditions of welfare. Thus the social worker came on the scene, not in the role of "Lady Bountiful" spreading sunshine, but in a fact-finding, case evaluating role. Government in welfare could not operate otherwise. Welfare had to be detached from sentiment. In the United States, the old trade unions in particular, criticised this change. Business leaders who would not operate their enterprises on the basis of sentiment, criticised the impersonal character of the new public welfare. Recipients of public welfare who hated the old charity system, still could not understand the unsentimental methods that had to be used in dispensing public benefits. This was one of the revolutionary consequences of the Great Depression, government at all levels accepted a new welfare responsibility, and welfare changed from a primary to a secondary activity.[14]

This changeover was almost mandatory; with the labour force of the nation at about fifty million, the number of employed at times exceeded ten million. After waiting four years for the depression to end, with private enterprise unable to provide jobs, government finally had to act. The long depression clearly demonstrated that, however able and willing workers may be, they cannot put themselves to work on jobs of their own making, not in the industrial urban community. The long depression also demonstrated that unemployment places great strain on the family. Youth in large numbers left home to wander about the country. To meet this problem a special work programme for youth was organized in the national forests and parks.

Family solidarity is often found to be stronger in times of crisis, the outside situation driving family closer together. Studies by Burgess and others showed that during the depression there was considerable crisis within the family.[15] Ishwaran found that the family in Holland was driven closer together by the crisis of the war and postwar period.

> The crisis did not result in the disruption of the family. During the hunger winter in Holland, disintegration of the family did indeed occur in some cases, but they were only exceptional cases. According to our informants, family spirit carried high social value. Every Dutchman involved in this situation showed his willingness to incur many risks of all kinds, if this was necessary to save his family, even if he had to sacrifice his own life. Affected by the war and by the hunger winter, the family experienced innumerable calamities. In this period the Dutchman's sense of responsibility and love for his family and friends were the principal

motives that often led to really severe trials as he travelled for days to gather food.[16]

In the modern community, as Bakke found, neighbours are not always ready to come to the aid of neighbours in need.[17] Unemployed persons would not let their need be known, being well aware that neighbours might avoid the jobless men lest he try to get aid from them Neighbours may cooperate fully on matters that concern their community as a whole, but a family in need is something else , it retreats to its privacy. Yet the most violent critics of mass public relief in the United States never ceased to argue that the natural place for the needy to get relief is in the local community among their neighbours. The old idea of primary-group welfare did not fit in the secondary group urban industrial community. Moreover, in the secondary-group community one's neighbours are mostly of the marginal-acquaintance type.[17]

Work and Welfare Interdependence

One distinction of importance when we compare the rural primary society with the urban secondary society concerns the city man's imperative need to save and accumulate. Despite complaints about the materialism of the industrial urban civilization, it could not have evolved without its will to accumulate. The farmer may be forced to live frugally and to avoid waste, but he is not driven by the hard imperative to save. He may store fodder for his animals, enough for the winter and a little longer, not for years ahe l. He stores food for his family, but he does not pile it up as if for "seven years of famine." That would be uneconomical and not necessary, his security is in his land.

Having no such natural storehouse to rely on, urban man must accumulate. His savings are invested in buildings, machines, work organizations, transportation and communication systems and other properties. He invests his savings in himself when he accumulates education and skill, resources used in his employment. Collectively, the urban community accumulates knowledge and experience which is stored in museums, libraries and educational institutions. Urban man invested ways to store wealth in terms of symbols on pieces of paper.

These are credits in the form of stocks, bonds or bank accounts. Groups as well as individuals may accumulate wealth, the corporation being a group property. Groups may save money for their economic security, which may be welfare or pension funds. Governments, in the name of the community, is the holder of many kinds of public-use property. Government may also hold funds in trust for the people, as it does in national insurance programmes; health insurance, unemployment insurance and so on.

With governments accumulating and dispersing funds for welfare, the question arises regarding the old compulsion upon the individual, for example, to save for his old age. If everyone in a time of depression served to his utmost, the result of such saving would be to increase unemployment. On the other hand, if nobody saved during a period of full employment, this might bring about inflation. The industrial economy prospers as people spend and consume, however, during a time of inflation it may be more in the interest of the general welfare for people, temporarily at least, to save[18]

Welfare saving by the friendly societies, as mentioned above, was a primary-group way of meeting need. It was laudable as a social effort, but it was not economically effective. Welfare saving under a system publicly administered and guaranteed is a secondary-group way of meeting need. It pools the savings, not merely of a circle of friends, but of great numbers. The circle of friends may go on pooling their savings, if they will, but the burden of welfare is carried by the gigantic public fund saved by all the people.

Welfare, Bureaucracy and Social Work

Public welfare systems, especially by those who disapprove of public welfare, are often criticised for being bureaucratic. Most organizations in the urban community, in particular large industries, tend to be bureaucratic. This is hardly to be avoided since the management of their affairs tends to demand much paper work. Any welfare programme, in terms of administration, is a work organization, and it must be in the most exact sense a record-keeping organization. It must have a bureaucracy and a very efficient one. Health insurance, old-age security, unemployment insurance, there must be a special account for each individual and each account must be kept up to date. This goes on in many cases even after the individual dies.

Occasionally a bureaucracy may be inefficient and sluggish or its functioning may become chaotic but in a welfare bureaucracy this would lead to such violent protest that a welfare agency dare not risk sluggishness. It is usually the single case out of hundreds or thousands that gets talked about.

Bureaucracy is that phase of any work in secondary society which involves the making and keeping of records and the performance of office work in accordance with agreements, directives, ordinances or law. Welfare work divides into a twofold labour ; paperwork in the office and personal contact in the field, although certain types of personal contact is confined to offices where people are interviewed.

A word needs to be said in conclusion about this phase of public welfare in which the agency meets the people, which can take place only in the local community. In most countries this is coming to be a professional service, the new profession of social work which has been entering community service mainly since about 1920. The social worker is becoming a key professional in the organization of community, the interpretor of welfare to the people and the confidential adviser of people, especially of families in a great variety of problems, relating to employment, education, agency help in case of need, family unity problems or the problems of difficult children. Actually, the more the social worker functions in the community the more he or she come to be accepted and trusted.

"Lady Bountiful," representing the earlier concept of charity. is being replaced by these professional servants. For the training of such workers schools are being established at the university level in many countries.

Trends and Prospects for Welfare

As we have seen in this chapter, there has been a transition in welfare from primary and personal systems to secondary impersonal ones, from an earlier type of charity organization to one of public organization. The first served well in the homogeneous acquaintance-group community, but the second was needed for the more heterogeneous mass society. Small-group types of welfare may continue in the urban agglomerate in various forms of mutual-aid associations, and these are socially desirable, but the bulk of the welfare load tends to be more and more a public responsibility. It is more expressive of urban life.

Perhaps in no country has the ideal welfare system been attained, but neither has any country evolved an ideal work system or a municipality that is ideally administered. These must be continually worked for. The evolution of welfare, a companion growth with the evolution of industrial work has been in its period of formation no more than a century, and much of this advance has taken place during the decades since 1920. Also most of this advance has taken place in the more industrial urban countries. But the principle of public responsibility for welfare is spreading to the new nations. Although the adequacy of these services may not be high, the commitments have been made.

CHAPTER 9

SOCIAL CONTROL IN URBAN SOCIETY

If a community exists and has a name that is evidence of its ongoing character, and it may be assumed that order exists within it. The order within a community tends to be self-maintaining and habitual, which means that it also has a history. This ongoing and self-contained aspect of community life was identified in Chapter 2 as a social process. People who share a habitat, however different they may be ethnically and culturally, and however competitive their relationships, must find ways of living together in some give and take fashion with a minimum of friction. Thus the social process, in addition to its other qualities, is a disciplined way of living together. It is the inner regulation of society which evolves the discipline usually identified as social control.

Social control is found in any group of community, but our attention in this chapter concerns the urban community where, more than in the rural community, such elements as impersonalism and anonymity figure in human relationships. This difference results in the evolution of unique instruments for control, such as written records and secondary organizations.

Primary Group Relationships

Chapter 5 included a description of the nature and utility of the primary group. It is the first group entered by the individual, the one in which his learning begins. In this kin group he begins learning the language, the values of right and wrong, the expected behaviours, which become elements in his personality. Many kinds of primary groups figure in the individual's life, but all have certain comm. , qualities; face-to-face contact, some intimacy, a degree of confidence, and each imposes some domination of a personal sort on the individual as he shares and contributes to their life and change. Usually the groups having the most lasting influence on the individual are the family and early play groups.[1] Not infrequently in the urban community the influence of the childhood play group may be greater than that of the family in some areas of behaviour.

Learning for the child is a continuous, often playful, concentration on habit formation, much of which takes place in the play group or in the bosom of the family. Actually, as Herman implies, habit formation in the family is-linked with and is the beginning of wider habit forming experience.

> The institution of the family consists of hundreds of understandings and expectations which fashion each generation; the meaning and patterns of fatherhood, motherhood, wifehood, husbandhood, childhood; the role of the oldest, middle and youngest child; how one acts as a boy or a girl; the economic responsibilities of the provider of the family. Family institutions, of course, differ in detail; one may be authoritarian, another democratic, another a mixture of the two (in school) the child receives another set of complex patterns.[2]

Entering adulthood, the individual becomes identified with various primary groups other than the family and each in its way figures in the development and the changing of his personality. As the adult becomes identified with some primary groups he may leave others behind. Village group attachments may continue with minor change through one's lifetime, which is often not possible in the city. Although the individual's social habits and values are formed mainly in primary groups, he acquires social, work and other habits in contact with secondary groups. It often happens in the urban community that certain habits necessary for participation in the family or other primary groups come into conflict with the habits and requirements of new primary groups to which one may become attached. The urban individual may thus have different behaviour systems; for example, some friends he invites to his home, others he does not. Secondary groups, according to their purposes, make still other demands on the invididual. The urbanized man becomes so oriented generally that the separate orientations do not confuse him.

Although primary groups in the urban community are often, if not continuously, under pressure to change, and although they do change, they do not disappear. Their influence on individual conduct may be ambivalent; since the individual at times may be more under the influence of certain groups than others, the importance of primary groups does not diminish. In some situations the teenager may be more loyal to his friends than to his family, or the elemental nuclear group of parents and children may "close itself in" against uncles, aunts, cousins and even grandparents, but this does not mean a rejection of family as a primary group. It often means only that the nuclear group temporarily prefers privacy or to make certain decisions on its own responsibility for its own purposes.

The Control Aspects of Work

It was noted in Chapter 5 that a man's social class is largely determined by his occupation and the income he derives from his work. In addition to giving a man status, work may have a more intimate role in his life. It puts him into a routine which determines his use of time during most of his waking hours. It helps to determine where he will be during these hours and with what people he will be in contact, even though only eight or so hours are spent at the work place. For one who may not have a consuming interest in his job, the work role may assume merely the character of a discipline for the day. And for all who work some discipline from work extends to the use of non-work time as of time for recreational leisure. A man who may be a disinterested worker may also be content to be regulated by the routine requirements of his employment, and he may be uneasy during days away from work when the discipline of the routine is absent. The discipline associated with having employment and going through an imposed time-use routine relieves the individual of making decisions about what he should do, where he should be and when. The continuity of his employment provides his daily and weekly rhythm.[3]

Besides defining one's time-use habits and serving as a means of keeping one occupied, work not infrequently is seen as a moral end as well as a means for which one should live. A religious meaning is attached to it and it becomes a reason for living, as eating is for the gourmand. Thus one works to earn money which enables him not only to sustain himself and his dependents, but if he is able to accumulate a surplus he can take pride in having used his work well; he is in a better position to be a good family member, friend or neighbour. Included in this religious meaning is the notion that work protects man against temptation: "The idle brain is the devil's workshop;" "The devil finds mischief still for idle hands to do." The worker is less exposed to evil influences. Here, as we noted in Chapter 6, is one of the reasons that some people regard the increase of leisure as a moral threat.

Such is the Puritan ideology of work, an ideology which had the major part in building the modern industrial urbanism; one gives time and thought to his job, and one is so attached to his work that other interests do not distract him. Work protects him against himself, but often at the cost of loneliness, since this way of using his time leaves him empty when he is confronted with non-work time, what some call art of living.[4]

The social control value of work, for the community as well as for the individual is well illustrated in times of mass unemployment, particularly if there is no system of unemployment insurance and no early prospect of full employment. The crowd on the street moves with less firmness and purpose, cordiality goes out of many associations, people linger on corners, not relaxed as in leisure and not intent as in work. A community in the depth of unemployment lives in an atmosphere of lassitude and disinterest. With the return of employment the tempo quickens and the movement of people presents again the aspect of confidence.

Western civilization, built as it was by ardent and continuous work, is now confronted with the challenge of increasing leisure. Some say that the old work orientation is being replaced by a leisure orientation.[5] But we must look for the evidences of the new orientation not in the old but in the young. Those who have been saturated by the ideology of work are prone to regard the increase of leisure with attitudes of concern, wondering what interest there can be to keep humans under control if the discipline of work is weakened.

Bureaucracy and Documents

Strauss observes that "Bureaucracy stands high on the list of modern discontents. Fear of bureaucracy has been growing at least since the beginning, of the present century, and public protests against its advance have found strident, and sometimes hysterical, expression after the two wars."[6] Bureaucracy, like leisure, has been coming into a world unprepared for it, not able to understand it, and yet not able to function without it. Mass society has come to mean mass organization for work, mass distribution systems, mass labour organizations, mass communications media, even mass leisure; and all of these have given cause for concern, usually by some who do not understand how necessary they are for agglomerate living. This trend is imperative if the metropolis is to feed itself, warm itself and keep itself employed. Living and working in the urban environment present the extreme example of the contractual society whose way of life is facilitated, sustained and insured through the instrumentality of documents and agreements which are written because their details cannot be trusted to memory. Thus enters with bureaucracy the paper work about which there has been a hue and cry.[7] Even the university, once a primary group of professors and a cluster of students, must now have its bureaucracy and its written records.

It would be hard to find any phase of industrial urban life that has not been bureaucratized, and the more depended on by numbers of people the more impelling the demand for bureaucracy. Even the elite in some cities, to safeguard their class status, establish a "social register." Here are listed the names of the first families and their geneologies, which are kept ready for easy reference. This is a bureaucracy of a kind, also an instrument for control. In the big city will be found a medical association and all physicians are expected to be members of it. The medical bureaucracy is a control instrument. It presumes to do a watchdog service for the health of the community, although in some countries "in the interest of the public" the medical association will use its bureaucracy to oppose any treatment for health which it does not supervise. This private system of control does serve a useful purpose in the community, although its primary purpose is to safeguard the interests of a professional group.

An industrial enterprise; steel plant, textile mill, movie studio, printing and publishing establishment, transportation system, or whatever else it may be, is a work organization, but it also has its front office where financial records, work records, records of sales and purchases and other documents are kept. The front office is a control centre which is linked with many other control centres. It is a necessary bureaucracy which grows with the operations of the enterprise. Each enterprise, like the "social register" or the medical association, has a direct control influence over some part of community life, but also an indirect influence over other parts. In the great city are thousands of bureaucracies including all kinds and sizes, and all must perform their roles rationally.

For every type of bureaucracy in the private sphere there is normally a corresponding bureaucracy in the public sphere, since the interest of the public must be safeguarded. If bureaucracy increases in the first sphere, it must necessarily increase in the second. If government decides to collect a sales tax or income tax at the source, its bureaucracy for collecting, verifying and recording it must be both adequate and efficient, while its records must square with those in the various private bureaucracies. Whatever the bureaucracy, it is an office where records are made and kept available for use and reference.

In a primary society records are not needed, since an agreement can be concluded with a handshake and the presence of witnesses. Neither party to the contract or the witnesses are likely to move away tomorrow, thus events and understandings can be left to memory. There is no need for writing down so much that goes into the record in the contractual urban society. Under this system a man can find at his place of employment his entire work history. Where he attended school can be found the record of the subjects he studied and the grades he earned. Records telling about him can be found in the organizations of which he is a member. In the offices of doctors, clinics and hospitals can be found the details of his medical history. Elsewhere are records of taxes he paid, properties he bought or sold and all other contacts with public authority. Whether he has a criminal record or not, in some appropriate office his fingerprints will be filed.

Here is a unique type of social control which is necessary in secondary society and its importance as a regulator of conduct is impressive. These records are witnesses which may cause the individual at times to fear, but they may come to his aid at other times. Even while recognizing the imperative need for records, Mumford uses harsh words about the growing use of paper and how people are influenced by it.

> Living *by* the record and *for* the record became one of the great stigmata of urban existence; indeed life as recorded—with all its temptation and overdramatization, illusory inflation and deliberate falsification—tended often to become more important than as life lived.[8]

This thought is followed by Mumford's observation about how the stores of records hold together a vast number of institutions and people as they give order to the impersonal and anonymous urbanism. The written word "maintained and transmitted a larger portion of their lives than individual human memories can transmit by word of mouth."[9] This paper aspect of mass work and living has become a firm part of modern life despite all objection and resistance to it, and it extends rapidly to rural society. It affords a firm and effective basis for social order and control. Its importance is often overlooked.

The Influence of Formal Groups

Secondary organizations as they have been described in previous chapters, are normally recognized as pressure groups; indeed, there is a tendency to expect them to exercise control over their members. There is the general assumption that if one joins a secondary organization he is willing to conform to its purposes and with respect to such purposes he will try to influence the thinking and behaviour of other persons. Such a secondary organization (medical association, trade union, church, political party, scientific body, cooperative society, employer group) exerts control influence in two directions. It maintains an inner control over its members and it endeavours to exert outer controls, which are the main reasons for its being. We will examine these two roles briefly.

1. FORMAL GROUPS AND THEIR MEMBERS

The leader of a secondary organization is not likely to be secure in his position if he does not have his members "under control;" a rival in the organization is likely to replace him. To accomplish particular purposes, the organization may call for united action at times on the part of its members; a strike by labour unions, a lockout by employers, protest actions by other groups (at this writing French farmers are blocking highways or dumping vegetables in public offices in their demand for higher prices). When leaders can get united action they are in a position to speak with authority for their members.

The better established a formal organization becomes, the more experience it has acquired and the more it has achieved through collective action, the greater is the likelihood that the members will accept the directives of their leaders and be influenced by their advice. In this respect, the size of the group may or may not be important. A trade union of makers of ink for printing may include less than a thousand members, but if all ink makers are members the leaders are in a strong, uncompromising position. A strike of ink makers can stop all printing in a nation! On the other hand, leaders of such a large organization as a political party may be confronted with divergent interest groups within; city Democrats, suburban Democrats and rural Democrats, and within each category will be the rich and poor Democrats as well as racial, ethnic and religious sectors. If a group is organized with respect to a particular interest, economic for example, the other distinctions may be of minor importance.

When formal groups are active, acting dramatically if the occasion calls for some united action, these behaviours not only demonstrate unity, they also foster feelings of unity within the group. The inner control also finds expression as members talk with members and others in their primary groups. On the importance of conversation, we quote Mumford:

> Take away the dramatic decisions of urban life, those of the arena, the law court, the trial, the parliament, the sport field, the council meeting, the debate, and half the essential activities of the city would vanish and more than half of the meaning would be diminished, if not nullified. Out of ritual and dramatic action in all their forms something even more

> important emerged; nothing less than the human dialogue. Perhaps the best definition of the city in its higher aspects is to say that it is a place designed to offer the widest facilities for significant conversation. The dialogue is one of the ultimate expressions of life in the city, the delicate flower of its long vegetative growth.[9]

The secondary organization is a device for ordering and unifying both conduct and thinking; it also affords substance and articulation for conversation.

2. PRESSURE BY FORMAL GROUPS

Every secondary group has some power to sustain its purpose and it normally is dynamically disposed to use this power. It may use its power in competing or in cooperating with other formal groups. Much of the activity of group leaders concerns relations between their own groups and others, often in some pro or con relation to public authority. Trade unions may join hands with an organization of educators and an organization of social workers in demanding improvements in the school system of the community. Business and industrial groups may join hands to resist such a proposal. Different formal organizations may take sides on some proposal for housing reform. For almost any problem of community concern there may be an issue between the organized groups long before public action is taken.

Formal secondary groups appear to be most articulate as well as most numerous in urban communities that are industrial especially if the population of the urban place is highly heterogeneous and cosmopolitan. Also it appears that the more developed these organizations become and the more sophisticated their leaders the more they are likely to become involved in the needs and affairs of the community. They are likely to insist on being represented on all community committees, especially committees or commissions formed by public authority. To Pekelis, writing as a lawyer, sees these groups were control instruments.

> All these cellular organisms have their own written and unwritten laws, their own enforcement devices, their own

> forms of social control, their own framework of pressure. When we see the individual challenging the power of the central authority, he does not, as a rule, act as an individual. He acts as a member of one of the communities. He is one of the tithing. He presents himself with his neighbours, or with others with whom he has common interests.[10]

It is not uncommon in the city to find social clubs which are social in only a single phase of their activities. An exclusive club of women of the elite class may be very sensitive about being "social only;" it gets itself involved in some community interest. It may sponsor some cultural interest and then endeavour to get other groups to join in the effort. For example, a city of a million inhabitants may not possess a real theatre and opera house, a matter of embarrassment for the sophisticated elites. This is a goal to work for and groups may join hands.

The leaders of the diversity of formal organizations in a city, however divergent their group interests may be, come in time to recognize that they have one interest in common; the welfare and advancement, the appearance and good name of their city. In these terms, they come to be a kind of inner group. Not unlikely these elites will join together into a formal organization, having their own meeting place with a lobby, a restaurant, small rooms where committees can hold conferences. Such a centre may be known as the city club or by some other appropriate name. This cluster of elites is a nucleus for control. Other groups bring together other elites, those, for example, who are not leaders of organizations. The very coming together of such groups and the collective influence they can wield; the press club, the artists and writers, contribute to the secondary-group controls which are so important in the urban community.[11]

Fashion and Status Competition

In the competition between secondary groups to influence community life, and in the efforts of group leaders to win favourable public opinion, may be detected a mixture of factors which figure in community control. There would be rivalry for popularity between leaders for public recognition.

Also there may be social rivalry between these elites. We need to keep in mind that, quite apart from the different secondary organizations, the urban population is divided into social classes. It is not unnatural for a man or woman of middle or lower class to rise to leadership in a secondary organization. As a representative of a trade union, one may find himself in a city-wide committee which would include persons from the upper class. In such meetings the labour leader is reminded in different subtle ways that, although equal on the committee, he is not regarded as equal in social class terms. The manager of an industrial enterprise may also be a member of the city-wide committee. He and the labour leader may be on friendly terms in the committee, but in the sphere of work they go different ways, and socially they are not of the same class. Compared with the wife of the manager, the wife of the labour leader may be as well dressed, but she is not likely to be invited to join the same social circles.

The existence of social class in communities where class distinctions are clearly drawn and where each person remains in the social class of his parents, such a system tends to be an instrument for social conrol. In such a situation the life and work of each person is strictly defined, the amount and kind of education he should have is fixed and his level of living is quite stable. In such a situation one would probably resist any change that would put him into a lower class and he does not entertain the idea of entering a higher class. Under relatively static conditions such a class system affords effective social control.

But the modern urban community, and every urban place aspires to be modern, such a static condition does not exist. With respect to work, such a system becomes inoperative as urban places become industrized. Class lines which separate people into categories weaken and the old system of social ordering and forbidding loses its effectiveness. It becomes possible for people to rise from lower to higher occupations, if the way is open for more education and training. People learn that by striving in the competitive labour markets they can increase their earnings, that they can move from lower to higher consumer levels. Upper classes, since their ranks can be invaded, go on the defensive against the lower classes. In countries where people have political equality they cannot be prevented from trying to gain economic equality, at least greater economic security. This is prefatory to striving for social equality.[12]

Social competition, which finds its extreme expression in American cities, also results in various ways to move up socially. New forms of recreation afford opportunities, in cafe society for example, for "lower-downs" who have money to meet the socially "higher-ups," to mingle on the dance floor and in cocktail parties. The boy of humble origin who graduated from Yale or Harvard, if he lives in or near New York, may also join the exclusive Yale Club or Harvard Club there. The poor boy who becomes a nationally known athlete (if his manners are right) may find access, if only to be admired, to exclusive circles. Thus a famous boxer married the daughter of a rich family and was changed into a business man. Labour leaders, scientists, movie personalities, do get into the upper groups, as does the occasional political leader. The movement politically is now reversing; wealthy men are turning to politics, something unheard of as late as 1920. Social-class consciousness is not put aside; it has retreated to new types of organization. The rich man as president, governor, senator becomes a model to be imitated for different reasons.

A half-century ago Simmel wrote an intriguing article about fashion, how in a dynamic, changing society, the mode may become a sort of control force dominating the aspirations of people. He saw the wealthy, cultured and intellectual elites at the top striving to be exclusively apart from the common herd but, despite their best efforts to be unique and distinctive, any fashion set by them quickly is imitated by others, and this holds for any area in which fashion can be expressed; vehicles, dress, speech, ornamentation, drinks, foods, and so on.[13]

Fashion, as seen by Simmel is a form of social discipline, a force for the control of behaviour, although not a force which can be consciously brought under control as was customary in the Middle Ages when only the Gentleman was permitted to fight with a sword; poor men had to use sticks. Poor men could not hunt with guns and hounds. In the pursuit of fashion, the upper classes are in a difficult position since no longer as formerly can they forbid the common man to wear the garb of a gentleman or to ride in a particular type of carriage. If their fashions are imitated, they have no choice but to turn to something new.

Perhaps it is today more in relation to the inner evidences of social class that striving for advancement in the industrial urban community acquires something like a force for social control. In the universities of most countries the classes are crowded. University enrollments in the United States climbed from less than 200,000 in 1900 to about four million in 1963. A university education, once the privilege of the upper classes, becomes a common privilege, the principal ladder for social climbing. Always the difficult part of moving into the upper classes; from lower class to middle class or from lower to higher levels in the middle class was a matter of acquiring the graces, the manners, the sophistication and other cultural marks of the class. This is the remaining aspect of the class struggle, so it seems, that may be regarded as a social control discipline.

Control Influence of Institutions

A system of ideas, plus modes of behaviour, plus social values and symbols, all joined into a firm and continuing structure, are the essential elements of an institution. MacIver makes a distinction between these elements and the organization of humans who, for example, make up a church.[14] In somewhat the same sense, education is an institution. Some who regard the church as an institution would also call the educational structure an institution. MacIver, apparently would see the system of religion (beliefs, ceremonies, books and behaviours) or the system of education as institutions. They are the reason for the church or the school. The church is a human organization with power motivations. The dominant church in a country may assume the right to control, or at least guide education. It may also assume the right to dominate politics and to have its own political party, even a church-dominated trade union organization. Church control in the name of religion is likely to be stern and unbending. Lamb wrote of London Sundays about 1800 :

> It is true I had my Sundays to myself; but Sundays,

> admirable as the institution of them is for purposes of worship, are for that very reason the very worst adapted for days unbending and recreation. In particular, there is a gloom for me attendant upon a city Sunday, a weight in the air. I miss the cheerful cries of London, the music and ballad singers—the buzz and stirring murmur of the streets. Those eternal bells depress me. The closed shops repel me. Prints, pictures, and all the glittering and endless succession of knacks and gewgaws and ostentatiously displayed wares of tradesmen, which make a weekday saunter through the less busy streets of the metropolis so delightful—are shut out nothing to be seen but unhappy countenances—or half-happy at best—of emancipated 'prentices and trade fork.'[15]

Far from being diminished, it is being brought to light that religion holds a key position in the social organization of some of the highly industrialized countries in Western Europe. Ishwaran describes the cultural scene in the Netherlands as a tug of war between different religious systems on the one hand and between the churches and secular institutions on the other.[16] A Dutch sociologist, Hofstee, writes this about religion in the Netherlands :

> The inhabitants of the Netherlands on the whole take religion very seriously. Although there are, of course, many people whose religious life is mainly a matter of routine, the relation to church and religion is to most people a matter of serious concern. The relatively high percentage of people who at the census do not want to be connected among the members of any church is therefore not to be taken as a symptom of a relatively slight interest in religious matters.
>
> The reverse may be true. In the Netherlands, religion and the church are considered such serious matters that tradition or other reasons relatively rarely induce people to state that they belong to a church if they do not have the inner conviction that, mentally and spiritually, they really do so. The seriousness with which church membership is held in the Netherlands is also apparent to another. Even if it is a matter of changing from one Protestant denomination to another, it will by the person in question and his surroundings

> be looked upon as an extremely grave step, often having a decisive influence on his relations with his family and friends. The relative ease with which, for example, the Protestants in the United States change their denomination is unimaginable to the Dutch church member.
>
> Just as it is not to be deduced from the present number of people who do not belong to any church, that the interest in church and religion is slight, so it is not to be concluded from the relative decrease of the number of church members . . . that the interest in religious matters is waning rapidly in the Netherlands.[17]

Social control in the name of religion may operate fairly well in the fully homogeneous communities of the Netherlands, but Lamb was protesting the same total control being imposed in a stiff, unimaginative manner upon heterogeneous London. In Lamb's time controls by organized religion reached into other aspects of city life, including the family and education. A holiday was not to be used for time-wasting recreation, but for worship. This single system of control in England has been replaced by one more in keeping with the heterogeneity of urban life. The transition does not exclude the church from certain special spheres of influence, but these tend to be more persuasive than mandatory.

These deprivations which the church, and perhaps other institutions, have had to accept with the advance of urbanism have seemingly not weakened its position in that sphere where its strength lies. Religion is a plan of life and salvation which brings to man a peace of mind and a sense of security in a universe of uncertainty. In this sphere religion, by church reports, has not diminished.

The function of education is to impart knowledge and skill, to convey desired attitudes and values, and to develop disciplined habits of learning. That approximately describes education wherever found, no less among people who never had the school. Primitive societies need no schools, the child learns what is needed from his parents, from older children and by observing the adults. In cities of the Middle Ages and earlier children also learned from parents what they needed to know about work, and from the church what they needed to know about religion. The son learned from his father what the father had learned from his.

Hand-me-down education is still standard in the schools of some less developed countries. Nash reports traditional and modern schools in Burma. Government promotes the modern school, but many villages cling to the old type. The modern school will prepare the child to enter a world that is changing and in which he must face new problems. In the other school change is not assumed. The teacher reads from the book and the children learn word for word the same lessons their parents learned. Only the teacher needs the book in a world where change is not expected.

> Education does not stop at the school exit, but of course, goes on in the home, in the play group, in the whole round of social interaction, in fact. In these other educational places the same features are observed, learning flows from respected elder to aweful junior, with a premium on rote learning. The educational system of the village is not detached enough from the rest of the institutional complex to have its own dynamic, standards or ethics.[18]

In the changing urban society a child at school must learn much that his parents learned, especially in the beginning years. As the child advances grade by grade the contents of his education begin to differ from what his parents learned. Much that the son must learn after his ninth or tenth years in school would be new to his father, and the change trend continues. While the content of education changes, the school continues in its old role of passing on a good share of the social heritage. Changes in education mainly concern technical knowledges and skills, which must change with changes in the sphere of work. As an institution, education is a system for passing on two kinds of learning. It faces the past as it transmits the cultural heritage, the social values of the community. It faces the future with a rational purpose when it imparts the learning a child needs in his future work.

The modern concept of education recognizes that one learns in school only a small part of what he needs to know; that school really teaches him how to learn, how to acquire knowledge and to evaluate it. Education gives the individual "tools to work with." It aims to put the individual in a position of self-confidance and rational inner control. Much of his learning is achieved after he takes his place in the world of continuous change.

The Compulsion of Law

Among all the devices for social control in the community, direct law enforcement as symbolized by the policeman who makes arrests plays a very small part. However, as a *presence,* that the law is there ready to be invoked at any time the symbol has an importance which can neither be measured or underestimated. Policemen in many cities are not permitted to have a trade union because, since trade unions claim the right to strike, the prospect of policemen leaving their posts is unthinkable. A city without policemen is something no responsible public authority would risk. Imagination becomes fear-motivated when people are confronted with the prospect that the all-seeing eye of the law may be closed for a short time.

Law tends to be enforced in many ways by other means than the policeman. Pound, whose name stands out as a social philosopher as well as a jurist, speaks of law as the inner order of groups and associations.

> As such it has two sides; experience and reason. Experience is a matter of time and place but, handed down by a traditional teaching and developed by reason, it has a universal aspect. Reason, on the other hand, is universal. To think of the world as an association with an inner order is not easy. It goes beyond experience. Indeed, it is only in the present century that jurists have been thinking of the state as a group or association, one of the many which organize certain of our activities without merging our personalities, and so as having an inner order of its own which we call law.[19]

To identify law as an inner order of organized society is quite in keeping with Durkheim's conception of organic solidarity, presented at the close of Chapter 5. Notwithstanding the idea of iner order for society in general, the law becomes real for many only in terms of its external symbols; police, courts, prisons. But even of these who need the visible aspects of law, few are arrested or need to be, and still fewer are sent to prison. Nevertheless, people become insecure if the symbols are not there.

Civil law becomes real in other ways as well. There are the many departments of government performing different services, but they do not function alone, nor could they without the cooperation of private groups. Government becomes a shared responsibility between public and private organizations. Public and private government, as Steiner puts it, differ in two basic respects. First, public government has sovereign power. It is the final and supreme authority over all persons within its geographical area. Private organizations include only portions of the people and they are rarely within geographical areas.

The second difference concerns membership. For private organizations membership is voluntary. For civil government membership is involuntary; all who enjoy membership by birth or permission, come under its jurisdiction for control or protection.[20] A third difference is that the private groups are concerned almost exclusively to promoting special interests, which may be to the injury or disadvantage of other privately organized groups, while civil government must be concerned about the proper interests of all the people, and their protection. A private group as it endeavors to influence government is called a lobby. Says Finer, the lobby system "brings knowledge and also emotions—favourable and unfavourable—to bear upon projected policies. In short, it embraces two democratic processes; the right to participate in the framing of public policy and the right to petition for redress of grievances. Without it, our constitution could not effectively operate."[21]

A lobby is normally seen as an organized pressure operating in relation to national government. The same pressure techniques are used in the municipality, but in the urban community it is part of the total process of day to day living together. The private elites and public officials are in continuous contact, social and otherwise. They are the inner community of the urban community.

CHAPTER 10

UTILIZING THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

SOCIAL control as considered in the previous chapter relates to the behaviour of people, and we noticed briefly some of the more salient types of control present in the urban community. Much of the behaviour of people in any community, notedly work-related behaviour, is in part determined by the natural situation of the community. Understandably, places of small size would be more influenced by the immediate physical environment than a large city. Often the small place depends more on the natural resources in its vicinity. A city may have access to more distant and more kinds of natural resources. More than the rural community, the urban place would have a measure of freedom in its choices of work, partly because it is more effected advantaged by technological change.

In this chapter we see this physical environment as man's habitat. We will note what it means for urban man, how he lives in it and with it, how he uses it, and how he is benefited or inconvenienced by it. However, in so brief a space we can touch some of the aspects only lightly

Cities and Their Regions

There is a growing interest in metropolitan regionalism, which is partly due to the growth and spread of cities, while the spread of cities is due, but not wholly, to the increase of urban population. When we speak of the spread of a city this usually means a decline in population density within the city, particularly near its center, and a rising population density at the border or beyond the border of the city. In this connection we must think of the city as the metropolis; the social and economic city rather than the city as a political jurisdiction. The spread includes the suburbs and often the "fringe." beyond.

Since the spread of cities has been faster in some countries than the growth of urban population, it means that urban people have more "elbow room" than before, and they need it to more effectively use the transportation that is making the spread possible. As more families possess automobiles they need more space for circulation. The family's sphere of contact and acquaintance widens geographically, perhaps several times wider than for a family of the same category in the same city a generation earlier. This trend is called decentralization, something that began in European and American cities soon after 1920, but much of it has taken place since about 1940. It has resulted in a gigantic redistribution of the urban population, often with an equally immense redistribution of work places, recreation facilities and public services. Urbanites under these circumstances live in an open city compared with the compact urban places of a century ago. They have escaped many of the irritating problems of the days of concentration, but in these days of decentralization they find problems of another kind.

In general, these problems, each of them to some degree, relate to the utilization of space. As when a family moves from cramped quarters into the spacious dwelling, metropolitan man finds himself in a habitat of wider dimensions. Like the family in a more ample house, he must find the most effective ways of occupying his new habitat. Admittedly, this may not be a present problem of urbanites in the cities of developing countries, but it would be unrealistic to assume that these cities will not one day also decentralize.

We have already considered in our examination of the ecology of cities how space tends to be divided and how different users of space, for economic and other reasons, tend to cluster. There is inherent in this spatial separation of functions something akin to a division of labour. This becomes even more evident when we observe the uses of space in connection with urban decentralization. Wide areas come to be allocated to industry; textile mills clustering in one area, steel plants in another, food processing in still another. A housing area for middle-class families is likely to include a thousand or more separate dwellings with its own separate business district. It may call itself a model village. An upper-class suburb may call itself a city. A housing development for factory workers may be an array of large apartment buildings, which may also become a self-administered municipality. These are specialized habitation areas of the metropolis, all integrated into the labour force of the metropolis. Other areas will be given to transportation (railroad yards, air fields) or to large warehouses and storage buildings.

The more a metropolitan community spreads and specializes the greater become the interdependence between the parts, but the major interdependence is between the centre of the metropolitan area and the outlying parts. This interdependence has a two-fold character, one relating to work and affairs and the other to non-work interests. With reference to the first interdependence, the central city serves various "front office" functions, financial functions as well as advisory functions. The big law firms, advertising firms, insurance offices and so on must be at a central point. The relationships in this interdependence are mainly economic, and that also means economic in the self-sustaining sense.

The other interdependence is more social, educational and cultural; the institutions of culture; libraries, museums, theatres, orchestras, high educational institutions and sophisticated clubs are logically found at the urban centre. They are so many services to the outlying areas, but an economic burden on the central city. The dominant newspapers are at the urban centre, as are the television and radio stations. These institutions and facilities give the city its colour and character and they must be central, nor can there be two central areas in a metropolitan region. If two cities stand side by side, called twin cities, the central area will be in but one of these.

The dimensions of a metropolitan region are difficult to delineate. Gottmann made a study of the Atlantic Seaboard of the United States, taking in the area from Washington on the south to Boston on the north, a stretch of nearly five hundred miles with New York at the mid point. In this area are about 37 million inhabitants, more than a fifth of the nation's population living on less than two percent of the land space of the nation. This region includes, other than New York, three cities of a million or more and about thirty cities of a half-million or less. To Gottmann this appears as a single metropolitan region. Every city in the region is to some degree a satellite of New York. In terms of industrial production, they are all linked; one could not stop work without inconveniencing the others. This is Megalopolis, a city that is a region, as Paris or

London, Bombay or Calcutta.[1]

Political Problems of Urbanism

We may well ask: To whom does a city belong when it becomes Megalopolis? That could be asked about any city of a million inhabitants, even of smaller urban places. In political terms, a city is a civil jurisdiction within a definitely marked geographical area. At one time that was a satisfactory method of containing people according to their relative numbers and in terms of their economic and social interests within geographical limits. Each area would have its own system for ordering its affairs. That was a convenient political device for maintaining order between communities; border lines were drawn between them. Here we come to a very unique distinction between communities of that time and our time.

Communities oriented to the modern industrialism and the modern commercialism, especially large urban communities, may feel themselves restricted by their political borders. Such an urban community, if it expands commercially and industrially, is like the mother hen whose chicks turn out to be ducklings. They can swim in the pond beyond her sphere of service and protection. She is stopped at the water's edge. The little community bordering on a large one, behaving in its political capacity, may endeavour to use its boundaries to inhibit the essential political functioning of the neighbouring city. Yet the little communiy is economically, socially and culturally inseparably part of the city. For the industrialized and urbanized community, which the metropolis is, the centre has a growing importance while the borders have a declining importance.[2]

It is highly necessary for the territory of a nation to be divided into sub-units which may be called states or provinces or republics. The several republics of Yugoslavia represent so many ethnic and traditional divisions of the country. This is an administrative convenience. It is also an administrative convenience when the state divides its territory into sub-units; county, district, canton. These lesser divisions in Europe were often so conveniently small that they could be personally known, since a man could walk in a day to any point within his political district. Within these counties, district or cantons would be towns, cities or villages, each with some form of political jurisdiction. Here is where difficulties began once people in towns and cities turned to modern urbanism and industrialism. The economic, cultural and social life of the city expands, but the political framework within which communities operate, initially intended to promote and protect economic, cultural and social life, remains static. This tendency to remain static tends to hamper a unified, meaningful and controlled growth for the entire region. The city as a politically organized body cannot operate beyond its border.[3]

Actually, metropolitan political problems involve much more than a contest between the city and its many border communities, each a smaller political entity resisting, and often fearing, the city as a larger political entity. It is the state that keeps the peace, protecting the political integrity of the smaller places. Were these obstacles to be removed, permitting the city to operate under some regional authority, the real rivalry, between the metropolis and the state would come to the fore. If the area of the metropolis extends over the entire state into adjoining states, then its government may be stronger than that of its state. This would definitely be true for New York City vis-a-vis New York State, or for Chicago within the state of Illinois. For Chicago as well as New York the sphere of day by day contact extends far into three states If given all the political freedom it needs, although much less than demanded. there is the fear that the metropolis would tyrannize over the state as well as its suburbs.

How dominant and overpowering a metropolis can become, even within its nation, is well illustrated in the case of Paris. Fitzgibbon brings to our attention the example of Montevidio and its dominant position in Uruguay, a city that waxes while its hinterland wanes. Here is a third of the nation's population and two-thirds of the urban population, as well as most of Uruguay's industry. Here, too, are the main educational institutions, libraries, museums, as well as the dominant radio stations and newspapers. Almost all of the Uruguayan elites are in Montevidio. The rest of the country remains neglected as far as economic, social and cultural life are concerned, which indirectly handicaps development in Montevidio.[4]

Australia is a country in which, uniquely, urbanization was not preceded by a long history of ruralism. Each state has its one main city and the growth of population has been mainly in the cities. The cities enjoy the maximum freedom to spread without the harrassing political interference of suburbs. Sydney, with 2.3 million inhabitants, three-fourths of the population of New South Wales, is one of the world's most thinly-spread cities. Its administration for most essential functions is a joint arrangement between city and county. Its suburbs are part of itself. Freedom from political restricts has only opened the way for other problems; the wide streets are not wide enough to serve traffic demands. Other world cities may be harrassed by their satellite towns, but Sydney faces the problem of building satellites to relieve the pressure on the central city. There is no political struggle between city and suburbs which divide the metropolis. Thus Sydney can build an opera house, one that does not belong to the central city alone, but to the whole metropolis. There are problems, but problems of other kinds.[5]

Transportation and Access

Cities must have free contact with the outside, that food and raw materials may be brought in and finished goods can be taken to outside markets. When cities became industrial, they needed roads as never before, especially roads between cities. Rural people were never eager for improved roads, as they also never gave much thought to improved means of transportation, not until recent decades when farmers and villagers also became automobile owners. Generally, it was the urban sector that initiated roads and still better roads, as well as still better means of transportation; indeed, transportation technology has been almost entirely an urban interest. Likewise it was mainly the city that promoted improvements in communications, necessary to make the best use of improved transportation. The United States with its far-flung rail and road systems and well over 60 million automobiles, had 67 million telephones in 1959, more than half of the telephones in the world. Telephone densities are greatest in countries where automobile densities are high and both densities are greatest in the cities.

As a population becomes more urban it also becomes more mobile, and it becomes more mobile as the technics of transportation and communication improve. Access for urban people means more than ready movement into and out of a city, the parts of a metropolis must be accessible to one another. For a country like Britain or France, most of the miles travelled by motor vehicles is in the nature of metropolitan circulation. Widely-spread Sydney, with an automobile density equal to a third of the population, has difficulty making its total region available to all people who will go here and there, yet the streets are wide and straight.[6] Access to and from the hinterland is made difficult because of access demands within the city. Los Angeles is also a city with a high automobile density, where public transportation systems cannot prosper because too few people ride buses. On the other hand, more people feel forced to use their automobiles because the bus service is irregular and not convenient, a vicious circle in urban transport.

Such high automobile densities are not found in the British cities and the public transit systems there are extensively used, yet these cities have their traffic congestion. Green observes that through the years Manchester has tried many methods for ridding the city of congestion, but each improvement, while providing temporary relief, was followed by greater congestion. He concludes that to meet the problem something very different is needed.

> It is in fact impossible to pour a quart of traffic into the pint pot of the city centre but a solution to its transport difficulties must be found if the urban complex is to continue to exist as a thriving society. The answer may well be to split peak traffic by locating industry away from the central commercial areas, by ranking different kinds of industry and commerce according to their capacities to generate traffic and by planning the development and redevelopment of land uses on this basis in conjunction with regionally-designed highway and public transport systems.[7]

As people in any country attain a higher level of living the number of private motor vehicles may be expected to increase. Whatever this increase, the amount of money spent for private vehicles and their maintenance will likely be less than the sums of public money expended to pave roads, widen streets, build bridges, control the traffic and so on. Roadbuilding is often difficult and expensive; for example in mountainous regions (Rio de Janeiro), wet, boggy areas (New Orleans), or where great distances lie between cities as in Australia or Congo. Neither industrialism or city building can go forward in such a region as Congo until there are good roads. Nor can the rural areas between cities be adequately developed without roads of access to town and cities.

Urban transportation problems assume different aspects with changes in the organization of work. An increase in the number of industrial plants means an increase in the number of heavy-duty vehicles. The traffic in a city having no industry would be composed mainly of passenger vehicles and vehicles used for deliveries. If the level of living of an urban population rises, one reaction would be an increase in the number of automobiles. Moreover, the traffic problem may change from day to day (work day compared with holiday), or in the course of the day, as in some regions where trucks or lorries with heavy loads travel by night.

In developing countries the urban traffic problem is often aggravated because streets are used for all types of vehicles: handcarts pulled by men or ox carts as in Calcutta, the movement of laden donkey or camels through the streets as in Cairo; as well as heavy and light motor vehicles. The slow vehicles set the pace for all the rest. In European and American cities this was even more true before the advent of the automobile. All horse-drawn vehicles were slower than motor vehicles, but heavily laden wagons were slower still. Even with severe congestion, the flow of motor traffic is about fifteen miles an hour, whereas horse-drawn traffic could rarely move more than four miles an hour.[8]

Water Supply and Sewage

Many who talk about city planning and control will devote most of their discussion to transportation, a problem that becomes more challenging as cities spread over more space, become more industrial and make greater use of motor vehicles. Not less serious are those problems relating to water supply and sewage. Water in many ways may be a permissive, a limit-ing or even a compelling factor in determining the location, size and shape of communities. It is no less important as it is used for human or animal consumption or in a work process or in keeping man and his habitat clean. Kuwait is a port city with a barren desert hinterland. For many years water for drinking and cooking had to be transported by boats from a distant river. Today Kuwait is a rich oil-well city. It can now afford to draw its water from the Persian Gulf, pumped through de-salting plants. The demand for water in the Los Angeles region far exceeds the local supply. New sources had to be procured from other valleys as far as four hundred miles away. Thus water was not only taken out of its natural course, it was taken from irrigation uses for food production.

Urban man has greater water needs than his country cousin, and even for similar needs his practices are different. He must hold supplies in reserve, guard it against contamination, conduct it through pipes to his kitchen, bath room and work place, and then it must be led away through other pipes into the sewer system. This used water ultimately gets back into some stream, but first the waste must be removed from it, or *should* be. This is not always done, with the result that streams and water bodies may be polluted, rendered unsafe for fish and unfit for recreational uses, as well as being a health hazard.

Urban man uses but a small part of his piped water supply to meet personal needs. More is needed in connection with the work processes of industry and still more is needed to keep the city clean, or it is used for protection against fire. As cities begin to feel social and cultural pride, they begin using this water for fountains, decorative ponds and swimming pools, for parks with grass and flowers, for zoological and botanical gardens. In regions of limited rainfall where there is a scarcity of water for an irrigation agriculture, urban uses compete with rural uses. An increasing urban demand means less water for the production of food. If the regional supply is ample the per capita urban consumption for all purposes may exceed two hundred gallons per day, whereas it may be no more than thirty gallons per person per day in dry regions.[9]

However much cities, towns and villages in the same river basin may dispute about other matters, their common problems about water supply must be approached with rational methods.

Even here there may be disputes, but finally, perhaps after incompetence and waste, the realities must be faced. As their demands increase, they must find ways of sharing the common supply. For example, the Government of India has been advising the States of Maharastra, Andhra, Madras and Mysore about the use of the waters of the Krishna and Godavari rivers flowing through their areas, while these four states have been engaged in a long-standing feud resulting in the wastage of water. Water is wasted, for example, if a stream is polluted and cannot be used without expensive purification by downstream cities. Water needs compel cooperation in other ways, as when the pollution of the water supply puts all streams and water bodies in a region out of use for recreation purposes. An example concerns the paper mills in Dandeli in the south of India which are held responsible for polluting the waters of River Kali, causing an uproar in the surrounding areas.

In relation to urban water uses we find a prime example of the interdependence of cities in a particular region. Water supply is one resource in the physical environment that is fixed and limited, but in the final test cities find ways of sharing it. This may pave the way for other planned interdependencies. Other natural resources may be no less limited and fixed, such as space for recreation.

Metropolitan Space for Leisure

New York for many years disposed of its garbage and other solid waste, including dead animals, by loading it on huge barges which were towed far from the shore and dumped into the sea. Much of this garbage floated back to the shore a hundred miles to the south where Atlantic City and other seashore resorts are located, patronized mainly by New York citizens. After years of complaint the practice was abandoned. It illustrates the stake a city has in remote recreation places.

Out of a million urban workers in a Western city, at least half in the course of the year will make from one to several journeys with their families to beaches, mountain parks, riverside play areas or woodland camping spots. During certain summer holidays in France so many people leave Paris that one hears the expression, "Paris is abandoned to the tourists." It would be unusual for a foreign tourist in France to go any other place, as it would be unusual for a Parisian to take his vacation in another country. This use of outlying places by urbanites for recreation appears to be on the increase. Whereas it was unusual in 1900 for the urban crowd to venture more than ten miles from the city (mostly on bicycle), it has now become quite normal today for urbanites to find recreation spots up to fifty miles outside the city.

The increasing amounts of leisure coming to urban workers is bringing about an unprecedented rural-urban relationship. The shut-in aspect of urban life began to pass with the invention of the bicycle, and the trend was quickened with the arrival of the automobile. Once it was only the rich who could afford to visit the country for recreation reasons; the country, said Mumford, served "as an asylum for the preservation of illusion."[10] It has changed from being the area of escape for the privileged few to being the playground of the many.

By 1940 practically all levels of population in the industrial countries had acquired the "habit" of travelling on holiday to out-of-town places. This trend has kept paçe with the evolving idea that urban people have a *right* to recreation space outside the cities. The country is less identified as the source of food supply and more associated with the concept, "outdoors." Public policy tends to be swayed by this growing attitude. Rural people, at first irritated by the periodic exodus from the city, now find that they too can share in money spent for leisure. Thus, remote poverty-burdened mountain villages suddenly become play areas, and once inaccessible fishing villages have become the popular haunts of vacationers.

With respect of environmental control and planning, this growing demand for recreation space raises problems for both city and region. Space in the region, like space in the city, tends to be encroached upon by all sorts of uses. Fortunately, much space suitable for leisure is not suitable for industry, although it may be in demand for residence. Two demands come to the fore, neither of which can be served except by public action. One demand comes from nature lovers who want areas set aside for the preservation of wild life, especially birds and small animals, which otherwise may soon be extinct. The other demand comes from the groups promoting outdoor leisure activity (supported by the industries making boats, tents, and other outdoor recreation equipment, including equipment for hunting and fishing). These two demands are not in conflict.

Urban Habitat and Planning

From kings to politicians and to professional planners, from architects to engineers and to ordinary people with dreams, books have been written about the planning of cities. There is a library of literature on this subject; how best to make the city a good place to live, but the how and the what of urban planning must be passed over here. There is space only for some observations on the why of planning the urban habitat. We leave those phases of the subject with recognizing that most planning approaches are concerned with manipulating different elements in the physical environment to add utility or beauty or both.

Such a focus on the natural environment might concern the removal of a hill, the filling of a swamp, converting a marshland into a park, or reclaiming it as industrial land, changing the course of a stream or dredging it for better navigation, removing a forest or planting a forest, tunneling through a mountain and so on. With reference to other man-made elements, planning may concern the construction of highways or bridges, the erection or removal of buildings, or public control over the location of different kinds of structures.

In general, planning is rational control, making use of urban land in some logical relation to other land uses, coordinating inner and outer city land uses. Viewed in long-term perspective, most of such community planning known to us, says Boskoff, has been disappointing, and he names four reasons for it:

1. Inadequate use of existing knowledge,
2. Poor understanding and faulty cooperation from the majority of citizens;
3. Wavering sincerity and arrogance of planning officials; and
4. Interference resulting from the policies of other communities and societies.[11]

Notions about planning usually come to the fore in situations when a community is confronted with change. There may then be a disposition on the part of local leader to direct the course of change, or at least to avoid some of its ill effects. The possibility may be evident that the course of change in one direction may be more beneficial than if it moves in another direction. The difficulty is that if the best knowledge available is used, it may later turn out to be faulty. Often the best knowledge is not used because it may seem to be too bold a challenge to experience and customary arrangements, which are rarely set aside in toto when planning decisions are made.[12] Whatever the circumstances, one purpose of planning is to anticipate change, and therein is implied the idea that planners, besides having understandable goals in mind, are able somewhat to visualize trends. The reward of planning would be realized in reaching these goals or in moving toward them, and in realizing certain anticipated values.

Understandably, planning for the urban community and its region will stir up continuous disagreement, which may be about goals, methods, timing or details of the plan. Some who disagree may fear the plan will damage their economic interests. They do not oppose planning; instead, they offer amendments. Thus the ideal as rationalized is rarely realized. Frequently the ideal comes out of the past and the plan would restore something, recapture or redevelop. Areas in American cities that have been declining because of decentralization need to be rebuilt. The term "renewal" is coming into use. On this idea we quote Dyckman:

> The present effort of urban renewal may, in the long run, appear as a last-ditch effort to save the old form of the city and the style of life it supported. Paradoxically, the mobilized corporate necessity for the large changes has in this instance been devoted to the braking of change. The individuals in the market, voting with their dollars and their feet, have shown little interest in this nostalgis for the old forms. What is more, the people who show the greatest enthusiasm for the new forms of urban living—the suburban and exurban varieties—are drawn from the ranks of the conformist, security-oriented "organization men." This suggests that there

> is a covert understanding that the dominant corporate image is favorable to the new forms, despite a token allegiance to the old city.[13]

If this is correct, as evidence seems to indicate, many people speak for the old urban forms (easier to agree than to argue) but they behave in relation to the new ones. Thus, if the image of the plan is never fully realized, one reason may be that it was never fully believed in.

Community Order and Beauty

Not to plan is to invite confusion and waste in the use of metropolitan space. Waste due to faulty planning or to no planning will appear in disturbing forms later, although in some cases the seemingly unplanned turns out well. On the other hand, the seemingly well planned may turn out badly, like streets planned before the arrival of the automobile. This would be excusable waste, but it would not be excusable if the refuge of factories is dumped into streams to pollute the water. The improper construction of buildings can be wasteful; for example, building homes for workers in which poor material is used and faulty workmanship tolerated. Money saved in construction is later lost many times over in repair costs.

Planning should contribute something to order in the community, which may help avoid confusion and the waste of energy in the round of daily living. Order exists in any ongoing community, even though the ideal of perfect order is never reached. Presumably planning helps the community move in the direction of perfect order.

It is helpful for order if there is a rational distribution of land use in the community, particularly the metropolitan community. That would mean transportation facilities would be reasonably adequate for the needs of different areas; industry, residence, trade, recreation, public service. Order would also mean that the amenities; gas, electric power, piped water, sewers, roads and streets are not unreasonably behind the demand, and there is an awareness of growth needs. Order would also mean that programmes to provide housing for the lower social and economic classes are not lagging behind the rate of obsolescence in old houses, and that plans are operative for the removal of the worst slums. Finally, order would also mean that programmes are under way for meeting the various institutional needs in all parts of the metropolitan area; shopping centres, schools, branch libraries, playgrounds and so on.[14]

Beauty is that aspect of order which meets the eye, often a most decisive aspect. Whether in the physical plant of the city or in the outlying uses of space, the presence or absence of beauty depends on the views. Some appearances in a metropolitan area which are shocking to some observers are not disturbing at all to others. Even intellectuals, who usually exhibit a special interest in these matters, differ widely among themselves about beauty in the layout and forms of the city and region. This applies no less to intellectuals found among the planners, such as those who long ago brought the baroque ideal to the fore, which has been roundly criticised by Mumford and others of our day; the straight streets, wide avenues, impressive facades, vistas and showiness, as not suited to the modern dynamic city.[15]

Regarding certain aspects of beauty there is general agreement, such as green places scattered about the city where people can sit a while and rest. It is called good to retain in the city as much as possible of natural beauty and to have a variety of places for recreation and sport. Certain institutions, monuments, etc. must be at the urban centre, while it is agreed that others should be dispersed (branch libraries). It is called good to rid the city of nuisances; disease-breeding, wet places, areas used for dumping rubbish, muddy streets that in dry weather give rise to dust, and it is called good to rid the city as much as possible of smoke, dirt and noise. The technology is available for making cities clean, healthy and attractive; the will must be there to use it.

INDEX

Administration and urbanism, 13-15
Age, sex distribution, 45-49
Agriculture and food, 40
Aileen, Rose, 91
Aiyappan, A., 91
Anderson, Nels, 73, 91, 92, 109
Animals and food supply, 53; and habitats, 60
Anomie and citizenship, 89
Anonymity and urbanism, 117-118
Apprenticeship, utiliy of, 99-100
Areas, ecological, 61-62, recreational, 64-65
Arendt, Hannah, 111, 125
Argawala, B. R., 80, 91
Articulation and formal groups, 153-154
Ascriptive groups, 117
Associations, voluntary, 15, 75-77
Authority and city, 111-112; and the family, 79-80; public and private, 154
Automation, fear of, 100-102; and leisure, 101-102; skill needs of, 100, 102
Automobile and urban change, 170-171

Bakke, E. Wight, 139,144
Barker, Ernest, 163
Barnett, Henrietta, 143
Batten, T. R., 19
Beals, Ralph L., 21
Beauty and planning, 178-179; and urban order, 179
Behaviour, ecological, 65; political, 110; social, 34-35; systems of, 142
Bernard, Jessie, 38
Beveridge, William H., 131, 142, 143
Birth control, views about, 54-55
Birth rates and urbanization, 49-50
Blake, Nelson M., 180
Bland, F. A., 180
Bogue, Donald J., 45, 56
Booth, Charles, 132
Bopegamage, A., 47, 56, 71, 73
Boskoff, Alvin, 37, 56, 59, 72, 87, 92, 142, 176, 180
Bott, Elizabeth, 38
Bremme, Gabrielle, 143
Brennan, Tom, 180
Briggs, Asa, 19, 37
Broom, Leonard, 55, 109, 125
Browning, Harley L., 46, 56
Bruno, Frank J., 143
Bureaucracy, and documents 148-150; rational, 14; types of, 150-151, and welfare, 140-141
Burgermeister, role of, 115
Burgess, Ernest W., 74, 92, 138, 144

Caplow, Theodore, 109
Casis, Ana, 49, 56
Caste system, and family, 80; social stratification, 84-85, and welfare, 86
Caven, Ruth S., 144
Central city and datellites, 120
Change and social class, 86
Charity, critics of, 130-131; logic of, 128-129
Children, number of, 49-50
Chombart de Lauwe, Jean, 45, 56
Chombart de Lauwe, Paul, 74
Church and social control, 157
Cities, "bigger and better," 51; centralized and decentralized, 166-167; as "consumers of population," 39-40; East and West, 1-3; and food supply, 39-41; and hinterlands, 112; and mar-

kets, 8, 111-112; planning of, 176-177; and population, 39-41, 42; pre-industrial, 13; rebuilding bombed, 64; and regions, 165-166; and size, 52; and welfare, 130
City-country differences, 2, 15-16
City-planning, ecology of, 71-72
City-suburb interdependence, 167
City-village similarities, 24
Citizen and vigilance, 118
Citizenship participation, 89-90
Civil authority, responsibilities of, 112
Civil and tribal law, 81-82
Clément, Pierre, 91, 92
Clock regulation of work, 102
Clocks and culture, 16
Cole, G. D. H., 19, 109
Collective action and control, 152
Commensalism and ecology, 69
Communities, antiquity of, 3
Community, and citizenship, 89-90, city and village, 24-25: and equilibrium, 87, image of, 22-24; organization of, 28-30; and social class, 155-156; solidarity in, 87; and welfare, 128-129, and work, 27-28
Community conscience and welfare, 130
Community leaders and rivalry, 154-155
Community morale and class, 85-86; and employment, 148
Community order and beauty, 178-179
Community process, 34-35
Comparisons, rural-urban, 6-7
Competition, ecology of, 69-71, and leader control, 155-156
Compulsions of law, 161-162
Congestion and transportation, 170-171
Consumption and leisure, 106
Contact networks, 32-34, 77
Continuity of communities, 23
Continuum, rural-urban, 26-27
Contract and modern work, 95-97
Contractual groups, 77-79
Control and collective action, 152-153; and records, 148-150
Control aspects of work, 147-148
Control influence of elites, 154
Controls, professional, 115-116
Cooley, Charles H., 38
Cottrell, Leonard S. Jr., 55, 109, 125
"Counter urbanization," 15
Cowan, L. Gray, 28, 37
Crowe, James F., 57
Cultural innovation, 15-18; lag, 4
Culture and clocks, 17; definition, 20

Dandeker, Kamudini 55
Dandeker, V. E, 55
Davis, Kingsley, 55, 56, 125
Decentralization, urban, 166-167, 177
Defining community, 22-23
Definitions, use of, 23
Delhi, migration to, 47
Demography and sociology, 42-43
Developing countries, 15; and productivity, 101-102; and slums, 69, and transportation, 172; work in, 95
Devereux, Edward C., Jr., 31, 38
Dhekney, B. R., 49, 56
Diebold, John, 109
Discipline of clocks, 102-103; of work, 147-148
Discrimination and residence, 66-67
Disorganization and progress, 35-36
Division of labour, rural-urban, 8-9
Dominance, urban, 7-9
Dore, R. P., 79, 91, 109
Dotson, Floyd, 90
Dumazedier, Joffre, 105, 109
Duncan, Otis Dudley, 27, 37, 50, 56
Durand, Paul, 143
Durkheim, Emile, 86, 92, 161
Dyckman, John, 178, 180

East and West, urbanism in, 1-3
Ecological pattern, urban, 71-72
Ecological research, 59
Ecology and Commensalism, 69; and geography, 58-59; human, 58, 61-62; of land use, 70; and sentiment, 61-62, 63, of slums, 67-69; and space use, 61-62; of of urban change, 166-167
Economic interdependence, urban, 120
Economy and space use, 62
Education and the church, 159; and health, 113; levels of, 108; and occupation, 99; primitive, 159; social control and, 157, and tradition, 159
Efficiency, industrial, 97
Elites and community control, 154
Emergencies and urban government, 112-113
Employers, methods of, 96
Engineers and managers, 17
Environment and ecology, 58-59 mechanized, 17
Environmental control and leisure, 175
Equilibrium, Community, 87
Evolution, of neighbourhood, 31-32; of urban government, 113-114

Fabricant, Solomon, 125
Family, an authority system, 79-80; and individual, 145-146; and neighbourhood, 30; nuclear, 82; as primary group, 79-82, and social class, 86; and tribal law, 81-82; and unemployment, 138, and work, 94
Family centrism, 94
Family planning and population, 53-54
Family industries, 81
Family names and occupations, 108
"Family system" in Japan, 79
Fashion, dynamics of, 155-156; and social status, 154-156
Fear of automation, 100-102; of leisure, 103-104
Fiery, Walter, 73
Finer, S. E., 164
Fitzgibbon, Russell H., 169, 180
Folk culture, 15-16
Food and population, 39-41, 53-54
Formal groups and members, 151-152; and pressure, 153-154
Fraser, R. D. L., 180
Freymann, Moye W., 55
"Friendly Societies," role of, 131
Friendship and networks, 32-33
Functions of public authority, 112-113; of secondary groups, 77-79

Galbraith, John K., 137, 143
Gallaher, Art, 37
Galpin, Charles J., 19
Gentleman, tradition of, 156
Geography and ecology, 58-59
Gerth, H. H., 20, 163
Getting things done, 120
Gibbs, Jack P., 37, 51, 56
Gibson, Charles E., 20
Gill, Conrad, 19, 37
Gillin, Lewis M., 92
Ginsberg, M., 37
Gist, Noel P., 64, 73
Glass, Ruth, 74
Gottmann, Jean, 56, 112, 125, 167, 179, 180
Gould, Harold A., 85, 92
Gouldner, Alvin W., 125
Gouldner, Helen P., 125
Government, Civil, 14, 162; private and public, 121, 122; types of, 110; and welfare, 137-138
de Grazia, Sabastian, 21, 105, 109, 163
Great Depression and welfare, 138
Green, L. P., 125, 171, 180
Greer, Scott, 73, 180
Gregory, T.E., 19
Grigg, Charles M., 92
Groups, contractual, 77-79; primary, 145-146; secondary, 75-77

Guilds and welfare, 129-130
Gulick, Luther, 180

Habit and social control, 146
Hammond, Barbara, 38
Hammond, J. L., 38
Hand-me-down education, 160
Hansoon, Börje, 19
Hatt, Paul K., 37
Hawley, Amos H., 73
Health, insurance for, 134; and urban planning, 179; and water supply, 173-174
Herman, Abott, P., 146, 163
Hinterlands and cities, 112
Hoagland, Hudson, 56
Hobhouse, Leonard T., 37
Hofstee, E. W., 56, 158, 164
Hollingshead, August B., 163
Housing and slum removal, 179, and urban growth, 166 167
Hughes, Everett C., 98, 109
Human ecology, nature of, 58-60, and slums, 67-69
Hunter, Floyd, 92

Ibn Khaldun on rural life, 5
Ideas about urban growth, 50-51
Images of community, 22-24
Impersonalism and urbanism, 117-118
India, urbanization in, 52
Indian cities and population, 47-48
Indian villages, 29
Individual and formal groups, 151-152; and group contacts, 145-146; in labour market, 95; and his groups, 29; and private contacts
Industrial efficiency, 97
Industrial work, dimensions of, 95-97; and welfare, 142
Industrialism and occupation, 94-95; urban, 27-28; and urbanism, 1; and women, 82
Industry and culture, 16; and transportation, 170-171; and work, 30
Institutional planning needs, 179
Institutions, influence of, 157-158
Interdependence, ecological, 70; urban, 88
Invasion, ecological, 60
Invention and technics, 12-13
Inventions, social, 13
Ishwaran, K., 83, 92, 138, 144, 158, 163
Isolates and community actors, 85
Isolation and the cities, 119-120

Jobs and training, 98-99
Joint family, changes in, 80

Karve, I., 80, 91
Kleemeier, Robert W., 90
Klein, Viola, 91, 109
Konvitz, Milton R., 163
Kuper, Leo, 66, 73

Labour and welfare, 96-97
Labour force, age and sex composition, 46-49; and community, 27; and population, 42
Labour market, individual in, 95; and leisure, 107-108
Lamb, Charles, 157, 163
Land use and planning, 176
Land values, urban, 58
Landry, Adolphe, 45, 56
Larson, Otto N., 92
Lavers, G. R., 143
Law and civil government, 110; and social control, 161-162
Law enforcement, private, 161-162
Leaders and group control, 154; roles of, 90
Learning process under urbanism, 18
Leisure and automation, 100-102; and consumption, 106-107; defined, 93; and non-work, 105; planning and control, 175; rural and urban, 103; space for, 174-175; views about, 104; and work interdependence, 106
Level of education, 28

Level of living and leisure, 107-108; and mobility, 171-172
Lipson, E., 142
Lobbies, the role of, 162
Locke, Harvey J., 92
Lösch, August, 125
Luck, J. Murray, 57
Lundberg, George A., 92

Machines and automation, 100-102, role of, 96
MacIver, Robert M., 157, 163
Mahapatre, L. K., 91
Maine, Henry S., 11, 19
Male to female ratio, 47-48
Managers and engineers, 97
Mannheim, Karl, 106, 109, 180
Markets, ecology of, 61, urban, 111
Marriage and the family, 80-81
Marshall, T. H., 92
Mass leisure and mass culture, 108
Mass society and mass behaviour, 148-150
Mass unemployment and morale, 148
Mead, Margaret, 163
Mercier, Louis, Sabastian, 20
Merton, Robert K., 55, 109, 125
Metropolis and region, 165-166
Metropolitan controls, 168-169
Metropolitan habitat, widening, 166
Migrants, cityward, 81-82; age-sex composition, 46-49
Migration and food supply, 40; and population, 46-49; and slums, 67-69; and urbanization, 42
Mills, C. Wright, 20, 163
Mobility and leisure, 175; and residence, 64-65; and secondary groups, 77; and social class, 84-85; and urbanism, 170
Money, economy of, 9-10; and leisure, 106; rules of, 130
Morale and employment, 148
Morison, Robert S., 57
Morrison, William A., 55
Mukherjee, Ramkrishna, 26, 37
Muller, Herman J., 57
Mumford, Lewis, 11, 20, 111, 125, 151, 152, 163, 175, 179, 180, 181
Municipalities and administration, 113-115
Mutual-aid, aspects of, 131
Myrdal, Alva, 91, 109

Nash, Manning, 160, 161
Nath, V., 29, 37
Naville, Pierre, 100, 109
Neighbourhood, and family, 31; ideal of, 32-33
Neighbours, and social networks, 32-33; and welfare, 139
Nepotism at the work place, 116-117
Networks, city-to-city, 120; social, 32-34, and social equilibrium, 87
Minkoff, M. F., 108
Non-work and leisure, 93, 105-106; and spending, 106
Northrup, F. S. C., 164
Nuclear family trend, 82-83

Occupation, and education, 98-99; and social class, 84-85, 94-95
Occupations and skills, 97-100
Ogburn, William F., 91
Old age and disability, 133-134
Organization of work, 97
Organizations, secondary, 77-78
Origins of cities, 3
Orlans, Harold, 181
Out-of-town leisure space, 174-175

Park, Robert E., 69, 73, 74
Parsons, Talcott, 163
Pekelis, Alexander, 153, 163
People as community, 24
Personality, formation of, 145-146
Physical environment, nature of, 165
Planning, aspects of, 176-177; goals of, 177-178, limitations of, 177
Political behaviour, 110

Political boundaries and metropolis, 168
Political and professional models, 115
Politicians, the professional, 123-124, and social reform, 124
Politics rural-urban, 16, and urbanism, 168
"Poor house," and welfare, 131
Population, age and sex, 45-49, changes in 41-42 in cities, 43 in Indian cities, 47-48, and migration, 46-49, quality of, 53-54 rural and urban, 43-44 and selective control, 53-54
Pound, Roscoe, 164
Poverty, kinds of, 132
Power, and formal groups, 153-154 property and welfare, 127-128
Pre-industrial cities, 13
Pressure groups, nature of, 118, 153
Presthus, Robert V., 20, 91
Primary groups, the family, 79-82 nature of, 145-46, role of, 76 and welfare, 129
Primitive man and welfare, 127-128
Private bureaucracies, 149
Private enterprise and work 118
Private government, aspects of, 121
Private organizations and control 151
Private social welfare, 135
Process, community, 34-35
Productivity and labour, 97
Professional politicians, 123-124
Professional social service, 141
Professionalism and control, 115-116, in public service, 117
Progress defined, 35-36
Property and public authority, 111
Public and private controls, 151
Public authority, nature of, 10, 112
Public service, for leisure, 107, and professionalism, 113-114, rationality in, 116, social motivations of, 119, standards for, 113 types of 113
Public welfare, areas of, 133-134, attitudes about, 130-131, magnitude of, 137-138
Puritan ideology of work, 147

Quality of population, 53-54
Quinn, James A., 73

Radiation of urbanism, 18
Rational civil government, 117-118 of public service, 118
Rationale of bureaucracy, 150-151
Rauch, Katerine H., 144
Records, and bureaucracy, 149-150 and the individual, 151, uses of, 10, 79
Recreation, areas for, 175, and leisure, 93 and non work, 105-106
Redfield, Robert 163
Reform groups, urban, 114
Reform and politics, 123-124
Regions, metropolitan 165-166
Reigrotzki Eric 90
Reiss, Albert J Jr, 37, 50, 56
Relief, general public, 134
Religion and community control 157-158 and urban heterogeneity, 158 and welfare, 128-129
Research Ecological, 59, and population, 42-43
Residence, ecology of, 64-65
Rios José Arthur, 126
Risks of Life, 128
Rivalry, city-suburbs, 168-169
Roads and city walls, 26
Robertson, B C., 43, 56
Robson William A., 180
Rosenmayr, Ludwig, 63, 73
Roucek, Joseph S., 72
Rowntree, B Seebohm, 143
Rural man, 5, and leisure, 102-103
Rural sociology, 6
Rural-urban comparisons, 5-7; continuum, 26-27, differences, 15-16 land values, 58, population, 43-44

Saint-Simon, Henri, 14
Salz, Beate R., 102, 109
Samuelson, Paul, 144
Sanada, Tadashi, 92
Saving and security, 139-140
School and tools of knowledge, 160
Schrag, Clarence C., 92
Scott, Stanley, 180
Secondary groups, 146; defined, 75-76; functions of, 77-79; urban, 88-89
Secondary organizations, behaviour of, 151-153; leaders of, 154; and welfare, 121
Secondary welfare systems, 131-133
Security and markets, 112; and records, 11
Sentiment and ecology, 63
Sewage and water supply, 173-174
Sex and age composition, 46-49
Shepard, W. J., 110, 125
Shils, Edward, 163
Shimkin, Demitri, 20
Simmel, Georg, 156, 163
Simmons, Leo W., 142
Simon, Shena D., 19
Simpson, Richard L., 92
Sinclair, Robert, 125
Singh, Beljit, 55
Skills and occupations, 97-98
Slums and area change, 68 ecology of, 67-69
Smelzer, Neil J., 163
Smiles, Samuel, 20
Smith, T. Lynn, 21, 73
Social change and family, 82-83
Social class, defined, 83-84; and family, 86; and leader control, 155; and occupation, 94-95; and order, 86; and residence, 66; rivalry, 84; structure of, 85-86
Social compulsions and residence, 67
Social control, defined, 145; and social class, 155
Social discipline, and fashion, 156
Social distance, and residence, 64
Social equilibrium, 87
Social groups and class, 85-86
Social implications of water supply, 173
Social invention, 13
Social mobility and class, 155
Social networks, urban, 32-34
Social order and class, 86; and occupation, 94-95
Social ordering and forbidding, 155
Social organization, village, 29
Social process, 34, 35
Social research, urban, 121-122
Social welfare, areas of, 133-134
Social work, professional, 138-139; and welfare, 140-141
Sociology and demography, 41-42; and ecology, 71; urban, 6, 12, 19; and urban research, 122
Solidarity, community, 87
Sorokin, Pitirim A., 19
Sovani, N. V., 55
Space, competition for, 70; ecological, 59; residential, 64-65
Spending and leisure, 106
"Spoils system," political, 116
Standards of rational work, 118-119
Steiner, George A., 162, 164
Steward, Julian H., 20
Stockman, H. W., 143
Strangers, and anonymity, 25, and urban center, 61
Stratification and social class, 83-85
Strauss, E., 148, 163
Style of life, urban, 3, 18
Subsistence economy, 10
Succession, ecological, 60; and land use, 70-71
Survival, struggle for, 4
Svalastoga, Kaare, 90
Symbiosis, ecological, 70
Systems of welfare, 128-129

Technics, evolution of, 11-12
Technology and transportation, 170
Theodorson, George A., 58, 72, 73
Time, and man's work, 102-103; perspective of, 23; social implications of, 102

Time-use routine, 147
Time, work and leisure, 93
Trade unions, action by, 152; and control, 121; emergence of, 96-97
Tradition and innovation, 4-5
Training, occupational, 98-99
Transportation and access, 170-171; and urban growth, 166-167
Trends in urban growth, 50-52
Trends in welfare, 141-142
Tribal and civil law, 82
Turner, Roy, 55

Udy, Stanley H., Jr., 125
Unemployment, and automation, 100-102; mass, 138; and welfare, 133
Urban change, unpredictability of, 177
Urban center, ecology of, 61; functions of, 167; and land values, 65
Urban community, 23, and equilibrium, 87; government in, 110,
Urban demand for education, 166
Urban dominance, 7-9
Urban ecological pattern, 71-72
Urban government, evolution of, 112
Urban growth prospects, 49
Urban interdependence, 119-120
Urban land values, 58
Urban living, anonymity of, 117
Urban man, 4, habitat of, 165; and saving, 139; and security, 139; and time, 103, and water supply, 173
Urban organization and control, 149
Urban planning, antiquity of, 176-177; faults of, 177
Urban primary groups, 88
Urban reallocations, 166-167
Urban right to recreation, 175
Urban sex and age composition, 46-49
Urban social networks, 32-34
Urban social research, 121
Urban space for leisure, 174
Urban walls and markets, 112
Urban and rural populations, 43-44
Urbanism, and the citizen, 89; and clocks, 102-103; East and West, 1-3 and family, 82; and industrialism, 1; and learning, 17; neighbourhood, 30; paper needs of, 151, and political problems, 168-169; and religion, 157; and water supply, 173-174
Urbanization, defined, 18; degree of, 44; and migration, 42
Urban-rural comparisons, 6-7

Vandiver, Joseph S., 20
Vausson, Claude, 109
Vice, areas of, 71
Vigman, Fred K., 125
Village, and family, 81; groups in, 146, organization in, 28-30, and welfare ethic, 129
Voluntary societies, 131, 162

Walker, Patrick G., 109
Warner, W. Lloyd, 163
Waste and planning, 178-179
Water supply, and sewage, 172; and urban interdependence, 174
Way of life, urban, 3
Wealth and accumulation, 139
Webb, Beatrice, 142
Webb, Sidney, 142
Weber, Max, 14, 163
Wecter, Dixon, 144
Welfare, antiquity of, 8, 127, 130; and bureaucracy, 140; and private charity, 130-131; public, 135-136; rationale of, 135; and religion, 128-129; sentimental, 132; standards for, 136; secondary and impersonal, 137-138
"Welfare State," the, 137
Welfare systems, complexity of, 134
Welfare and work, interdependence, 140
Wesley, John, 130, 142

West, James, 30, 37
Wheeler, G C, 37
White, R Clyde, 135 143
Wilensky, Harold L, 76, 90
Willmott, Peter, 92
Work, control aspects 147 148 demands for education 160 161 evolution of, 94 95 industrial 40 41 organization of 97 and Puritan ideology 147 148, rational standards for 118 systems of, 99 and time, 102
Work leisure revolution 107
Work welfare interdependence, 139
Women and equality, 36
Women and migration, 46
World cities 120
Written records, perversity of 10 11

Xydias, Nelly 92

Young Michael, 92

Zimmerman Carle C 19
Zweig Ferdinand, 109